

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

VOL. XVIII.

BALTIMORE, JUNE, 1903.

No. 6.

MERLIN AND GANIEDA.

Sundry examinations of the twelfth-century Latin poem, the *Vita Merlini*,¹ now generally attributed by scholars to Geoffrey of Monmouth,² have shown that it is composed of material drawn from a great variety of sources blended with unusual freedom, and that a student should approach the separate incidents, hitherto undiscussed, somewhat sceptical of finding in them undistorted early tradition.³ This is particularly true of three episodes, or rather parts, of the poem, that at first do not appear to be closely related, but in which there are to be detected traces of a fairy-mistress theme told of Merlin and Ganieda long before the time of the French prose romances, our earliest extant sources for the familiar story of Merlin's love for the fay Niniane.

The most direct indication of the fairy-mistress theme is found in an episode altogether disconnected with the rest of the poem.

Merlin is dwelling in retirement in the Caledonian forest, and has been enjoying a discourse on the wonders of the universe from the lips of the bard Telgesinus. A diversion is created by the appearance of a madman, whom Merlin recognizes as a companion of earlier days. He accordingly relates to Telgesinus the story of a love of his youth, a maiden with whom he had passed many years of happiness, but whose favors he had finally spurned. She sought revenge by placing beneath a tree beside a fountain that she knew he would pass, certain poisoned apples, the taste of which would arouse frenzy. Merlin came to the fountain with some companions, but before he tasted the fruit his comrades chanced to partake of it. Instantly they were cast into a state of brute-like madness; like dogs they began to bite and tear their own flesh, and dashed howling into the woods. One of the

sufferers was Maeldinus, the madman whom the two prophets have met. Merlin bids him drink of the water of the fountain by the tree, and the draught immediately restores his reason.⁴

Transforming apples that are administered in revenge for spurned love have a place in folk-tales that are parallel in their main theme to this story. For example, in the modern Celtic tale, *The Three Soldiers*,⁵ a soldier, John, by standing on a wishing towel is transported with a princess whom he loves to a fairy island, where while he is asleep, his love deserts him. He finds on the island two kinds of apples, "and when he would eat one sort of them they would put a deer's head on him; and when he would eat another sort of them, they would put it off him." He takes a supply of these apples with him from the island, in disguise seeks the princess, and gives her the dangerous variety of fruit. Her hand is promised by her father to him who shall remove the deer's head. John at once administers the apples that serve as an antidote, and then gives himself the satisfaction of refusing to marry the princess. In a parallel Celtic tale, *The Son of the Knight of the Green Vesture*,⁶ one variety of apples is beautiful, the other ugly. The former makes the feet of the eater shake and his flesh melt from off his bones; the latter puts an end to these unhappy effects, and also has the power of healing. In still another version of the same theme, one kind of apples makes a wood of thatch grow about the eater's head; the other kind makes the wood vanish. Again the disastrous apples make the eater's nose grow through a forest and fifty miles beyond it.⁷

These modern Highland stories, then, which obviously could not have been influenced by the

¹ Ed. Michel and Wright, Paris and London, 1837.

² For a discussion of the authorship and date of this poem (ca. 1148), see *Vita Merlini*, pp. xcv ff; Ward, *Catalogue of Romances in the British Museum*, London, 1883-1893, I, 278 ff., 288; Mead, *Introduction to Merlin*, ed. Wheatley, London, 1875-1899, p. xciii; Lot, *Annales de Bretagne*, xv (1899-1900), 332-336.

³ See Ward, *Romania*, xxii (1893), 509; Lot, as above, 535; Brown, *Revue Celtique*, xxii (1901), 339 ff.

⁴ Vv. 1386-1457.

⁵ See Campbell, *Popular Tales of the West Highlands*, London, 1890, I, 181 ff.

⁶ See MacDougall, *Folk and Hero Tales*, London, 1891, pp. 227 ff., and note.

⁷ See MacDougall, as above, note; Campbell, *Popular Tales*, I, 195-198; Grimm, *Kinder- u. Hausmärchen*, Göttingen, 1856, III, 201 ff.; cf. MacInnes and Nutt, *Folk and Hero Tales*, London, 1890, pp. 87, 91.

Vita Merlini, contain a theme that is substantially at least as old as the twelfth century; moreover, they are so much the more coherent that they evidently show a purer form of the narrative than that in the Latin poem, which, unlike the Celtic stories fails to satisfy dramatic justice. We should certainly feel that we were nearer original material in the *Vita Merlini*, if the maiden's apples had taken effect upon Merlin, and not upon the innocent Maeldinus.⁸ An episode occurring in a much later source, an early thirteenth-century version of the Middle High German poem, *Wolfdietrich*,⁹ shows us more plainly what the outline of the real conclusion doubtless was. Here Else, an uncouth maiden gifted with magic power, comes one night in a repulsive form to the hero Wolfdietrich, and begs for his love. In revenge for his scornful refusal, she drives him mad by means of a spell, and he henceforth lives like a beast in the woods. It is only by bathing in a certain enchanted fountain that he is restored to his former condition. Then he is prepared to love Else, who by a timely plunge into the same fountain has been transformed into the most beautiful maiden in the world.

These parallels naturally suggest, in the first place, that the apples of Merlin's revengeful love were originally not poisonous, but magic fruit; and in the next place that, since other-world fruit, as is well known,¹⁰ if tasted by a mortal puts him

⁸ For a similar Irish story cf. *Acallamh na Senorach, The Colloquy of the Ancients* (see *Silva Gadelica*, ed. and trans. O'Grady, London and Edinburgh, 1892, II, 220, 221), which was probably composed in the thirteenth century, and embodies earlier material. One day as Finn and his warriors are assembled near a certain ford, a beautiful maiden draws near them, and tells Finn that she is of fairy birth and has come hither to seek his love. Finn promptly rejects her offer; whereupon she hands him a vessel of silver full of delicious mead, the taste of which casts him into a frenzy, and inspires him to taunt his comrades bitterly with all their mishaps in war. It is long before "the venom died out of Finn's tongue so that his sense and memory returned to him."

⁹ *Ortnit u. die Wolfdietriche*, ed. Amelung and Jänicke, Berlin, 1871-1873, I, *Wolfdietrich B*, II, st. 308-343. For the date see Paul, *Grundriss der germ. Phil.*, Strassburg, 1901, II, I, 251. For a discussion of this episode see Maynadier, *The Wife of Bath's Tale*, London, 1901, ch. IX; cf. p. 212.

¹⁰ An early example of the "magic power of Celtic other-world fruit is found in the *Echtra Condla*, which contains

at once under the fairy control, they were used, as the other-world maiden, Else, used her spell, by a fairy mistress who wished to compel her truant lover to yield her the love that she desired. The poet's justification for allowing the fickle Merlin to go unpunished is that, as we shall see, he has already been represented in the poem as in a state of frenzy from another cause; therefore if Geoffrey were using a source in which the faithless lover was the victim, it behooved him, rather than to

material very much earlier than the twelfth century; see Zimmer, *Zs. f. deutsches Alterthum*, XXXIII (1889), 262 ff. See also *ib.*, 155, 156; Stokes and Windisch, *Irish Texts*, Leipzig, 1884-1900, III, I, 203; Geoffrey of Monmouth, *Hist. Reg. Brit.*, ed. San Marte, Halle, 1854, p. 425; O'Looney, *Trans. Ossianic Soc.*, IV (1856), 249; G. Paris, *Romania*, VIII (1879), 50; Schofield, *Studies and Notes in Philology and Literature*, Boston, 1892-, v, 224; Hartland, *Science of Fairy Tales*, London, 1891, pp. 176, 177; Bugge, *Iduns Aebler*, in *Arkiv f. nordisk Filologi*, v, 1 ff.

Brandl has pointed out that the same kernel is contained in the incident from the *Vita Merlini* and in one that is told of the thirteenth-century Scottish prophet and bard, Thomas of Erceuldoune, or Thomas Rhymer, in whose legend there are not a few parallels to that of Merlin, and whose name is associated with Merlin's in many collections of prophecies (see *Thomas of Erceuldoune*, ed. Brandl, Berlin, 1880, pp. 23, 24; cf. further *ib.*, pp. 21-26; *Thomas of Erceuldoune*, ed. Murray, London, 1875, pp. xxx ff.; Ward, *Catalogue of Romances*, I, 328-337; Mead, *Introduction to Wheatley's Merlin*, p. lxxiv). "On a mery mornynge of Maye" Thomas, lying in the shade of a tree, was visited by the Elf Queen, to whom he lost no time in plighting his faith, and whom he gladly followed to her other-world abode. She led him to a fair garden, but as he put out his hand to pluck some of the fruit growing there in rich abundance, she forbade him, and warned him that if he should gather it his soul would go to the fire of hell (see vv. 187-192). For similar examples of other-world fruit see *Livre d' Artus*, P., summarized by Freymond, *Zs. f. fr. Sprache u. Lit.*, XVII (1895), §§ 147, 211, 230, 235-242; Chrétien de Troies, *Erec*, ed. Foerster, Halle, 1890, vv. 5748 ff.; Renier, *Mem. della R. A. delle Scienze di Torino*, Serie 2, XLI, 445; Child, *English and Scottish Popular Ballads*, Boston and New York, 1882-1898, I, 319. In *La Mort Artus* (summarized by P. Paris, *Les Romans de la Table Ronde*, Paris, 1868-1877, v, 341; cf. Malory, Bk. XVIII, ch. 3; *Li Chantari di Lancelotto*, ed. Birch, London, 1874, pp. 14 ff.) we read of a poisoned apple destined for Gawain by a knight, Avalon, who wishes to take vengeance for a former wrong,—a story that, owing to the knight's other-world name, looks suspiciously like an account of an other-world apple, rationalized as the episode in the *Vita Merlini* has been.

complicate Merlin's condition by twofold madness, to draw into his account another personage who should endure the effects of the magic fruit. Moreover Merlin has previously been restored to reason by a draught from a wonderful fountain. (On parallelism in incident as a characteristic of Geoffrey's method, see Fletcher, *Publ. of Modern Language Association*, xvi (1901), 472, n. 1.)

Ferdinand Lot in his recent study of the *Vita Merlini* calls attention to the fact that the name given to the madman, Maeldinus, brings to mind that of Maelduin, the hero of the other-world adventures related in the *Voyage of Maelduin*, an eighth or ninth century specimen of the Celtic *imrama* literature. "Que vient faire là ce nom," adds Lot, "on ne sait."¹¹ Maelduin in his famous voyage to the other world again and again comes across marvellous apples,¹² none of which, it is true, have the same quality as those of which Maeldinus partook to his sorrow. Once, however, when he tastes other-world fruit, he falls the principal victim to its power. On the twenty-ninth island that he visits, he and his comrades draw lots as to which one of their number shall test the qualities of some fruit that they find growing there; the lot falls on Maelduin, who after drinking of the juice of the fruit is cast into an enchanted slumber, and lies for some time in a druidic trance.¹³ Quite possibly with this story in mind, Geoffrey, when induced by the exigencies of his narrative to give a new conclusion to the incident, named the special sufferer in his episode, Maeldinus. The introduction of the name gives some additional ground for assuming that Geoffrey did not have before him a simple tale of poisoned apples. In that case there would have been no special reason why the name of a famous hero of other-world adventure should have occurred to his mind; whereas, if his original were a story of fairy fruit, he might appropriately have thought of using Maelduin's name.

When we examine the story of Merlin's madness, to which I have referred above, we find that the details support, rather than controvert, the hypothetical fairy-mistress theme.

Merlin is represented as a prophet and king of the

South Welsh, who at the time that the poem opens is fighting with allies against Guennolous, king of Scotland. The forces of Guennolous are routed, but in the contest many on the side of the allies fall, among others three brethren of the leader (*tresque ducis fratres*). Merlin bursts into violent lamentations at the sight. He buries the three brethren, then abandons himself to grief; he tears his hair, refuses food, and fills the air with his cries.

Et fugit ad silvas, nec vult fugiendo videri,
Ingrediturque nemus, gaudetque latere sub ornis;
Miraturque feras pascentes gramina saltus.
Nunc has insequitur, nunc cursu praeterit illas.
Utitur herbarum radicibus; utitur herbis;
Utitur arboreo fructu, morisque rubeti.
Fit silvester homo, quasi silvis editus esset,
Inde per aestatem totam; nullique repertus,
Oblitusque sui, cognatorumque suorum,
Delituit, silvis obductus more ferino.¹⁴

Merlin's madness and his life in the woods bring vividly to mind a very common situation in the romances and in much earlier material, that represents a hero, who is deprived of his reason subsequent to his loss of a fairy loved-one through some fault of his own, as fleeing to the forest, where he lives the life of a madman. The Celtic hero Cuchulinn, for example, is forced to renounce his fairy mistress, Fand, but when he has seen her depart from him, he becomes the victim of frenzy; he wanders in the mountains without food or drink, and is restored to reason only when the great enchanter, Manannan mac Lir, has shaken his cloak of forgetfulness between him and Fand.¹⁵ After Partonopeus has been, as he thinks, finally separated from the fay Melior owing to his disregard of her will, he gives himself up to despair; he neither eats nor drinks, he wastes away from grief, and turning a deaf ear to the consolations of his friends, resolves to flee with the greatest secrecy to the Ardennes, and yield himself a prey to the monsters of the forest. Here he lives until he is found by Melior's sister and led back to his lady.¹⁶ The young hero Florimont, too, when he has been separated from his loved-one, the fay of the Ile Celée, passes through a period of *folie* in the woods,

¹⁴ Vv. 74-83.

¹⁵ For the story of Cuchulinn and Fand, see the German translation of the *Serglige Conchulaind* (*Cuchulinn's Sick Bed*), by Zimmer, *Zs.f. vergleichende Sprachforschung*, xxviii (1887), 595 ff.; the French by D'Arbois de Jubainville, *L'Epopée Celtique en Irlande*, Paris, 1892, I, 174-216.

¹⁶ *Partonopeus*, ed. Crapelet, Paris, 1834, vv. 5319 ff., especially vv. 5367 ff.

¹¹ *Annales de Bretagne*, xv, 533.

¹² See *Zs.f. deutsches Alterthum*, xxxiii, 155, 156, 169.

¹³ *Ib.*, 168.

whence he emerges to enter upon a life of adventure in war.¹⁷ After Yvain remembers that he has not kept faith with Laudine and realizes that he has lost her love, he falls a prey to a similar madness. He secretly escapes from his friends, eludes their pursuit, and flees far from them into the woods, *com hom forsenez et sauvage*. Here he lives, until he is cured by a magic balm applied by some kindly ladies who find him in his sorry plight.¹⁸

These examples show us that the despair and the experiences in the woods attributed to Merlin by Geoffrey may be features derived from the same type of narrative as they; such a madness, in fact, may well have had a place in the original fairy episode that we have just seen possibly lies behind Geoffrey's version of the poisoned apples. We should have reason to doubt such a theory, if Geoffrey assigned a more satisfactory cause to Merlin's madness. Lot¹⁹ believes it probable that in several details and in two episodes of the *Vita Merlini* Geoffrey was using traditions concerning a mad prophet, Lailoken,²⁰ who had been guilty of stirring up strife among his countrymen, and in consequence by a decree from Heaven had been banished to the Caledonian forest, where he passed a solitary life. Lot points out that, while Lailoken's madness and banishment have been visited upon him as a punishment for his own misdeeds, and hence have a consistent place in his history, Merlin's madness is forced into the story of the *Vita Merlini*. Melancholy though the occasioning circumstances are, in an age of warfare and after a struggle that has ended successfully for his side, Merlin's frenzy and per-

sistent refusal to resume the ways of men form an extravagance of narration that does not, like the madness of Cuchulinn, belong to an accepted type of story. There is no evidence that Merlin and Lailoken had been identified in any way previous to the *Vita Merlini*,²¹ and if we accept Lot's view that the story of Lailoken probably influenced Geoffrey, we may with him regard the association as the product of the poet's own imagination. Common prophetic power might, of course, have given sufficient reason for Geoffrey to transfer to Merlin, king and prophet, events from the life of Lailoken, the frenzied inhabitant of the Caledonian forest; but if the Merlin tradition at the time when the *Vita Merlini* was being written already contained some tale of Merlin's madness in the woods, Geoffrey would surely have had a more natural point of departure for an association of the prophet with the mad Lailoken.

For further traces of a fairy-mistress theme we should turn to Ganiada.

Merlin's sister, Ganiada, wife of Rodarchus, king of the Cambrians, tries to induce her brother to give up his solitary existence in the Caledonian forest, but her words are all in vain, and except for two brief visits at court,²² he spends his life in the woods. Ganiada shows great solicitude for his welfare; at his bidding she herself builds a house in the forest for him, and comes frequently

²¹ See Lot, *Annales de Bretagne*, xv, 340, 343-347.

²² On one of these occasions (vv. 198 ff.) after Merlin has come to court, he is so eager to return to the forest, that Rodarchus orders him to be put into chains. There upon Merlin sinks into the deepest gloom and refuses to speak a word or to smile, until he sees the king remove with a jest a leaf caught in the hair of Ganiada, who has entered the hall. At this Merlin smiles, and when he is begged by Rodarchus to give the reason, he explains that he smiled because the king is more faithful to Ganiada than she is to him; for the leaf had fallen on her hair, while she listened to the words of a lover whom she had met in a grove. The queen protests that the charge is false, and at once arranges a series of tests with the object of convicting her brother of untruthfulness.

An examination of this episode, will be more appropriate in my projected study of Merlin. For the present purpose, however, it should be noted that the story is incomplete so far as Ganiada is concerned, for, although her tests serve to show the infallibility of Merlin's words, nothing further is said about his charge against her, nor does she harbor resentment against him, apparently, because of it. In short we can derive little, if any, information as to Ganiada herself from the incident.

¹⁷ Aimon de Varennes, *Florimont*, summarized by P. Paris, *MSS. franç. du Bibl. du Roi*, Paris, 1836-1848, III, 26 ff.

¹⁸ Chrétien de Troies, *Yvain*, ed. Foerster, Halle, 1887, vv. 2774 ff. Cf. the madness of Fergus, Guillaume le Clerc, *Fergus*, ed. Martin, Halle, 1872, vv. 3636 ff. See also Löseth, *Le Roman de Tristan*, Paris, 1890, §§ 80, 101-104; Paris, *R. T. R.*, iv, 65 ff., 347, 348; *Sir Orfeo*, ed. Zielke, Breslau, 1880, vv. 329 ff.; Kittredge, *Am. Journal Phil.*, VII, (1886), 188.

¹⁹ *Annales de Bretagne*, xv, 336 ff.

²⁰ Lailoken's life is known to us through two fragments from a Cottonian manuscript in the British Museum (*Titus A. XIX*, fol. 74-75), that have been published by Ward, *Romania*, xxii, 504 ff.

with supplies of food to visit him. Later she takes up her abode with him in the woods. On one occasion she is represented as becoming inspired, and bursting into prophetic utterances. The poem closes leaving Ganiada and Merlin in their woodland retreat.

The same criticism that is true of the place occupied by Merlin's madness in the scheme of the poem may justly be made of Ganiada's part. She offers to leave her husband and the court, and to follow Merlin to the woods and dwell there with him—a state of affairs that is not given a sufficient motive anywhere in the story. At Merlin's suggestion Ganiada goes back to court, only to discover the truth of his prophecy that she will find her husband dead. Accordingly she decides to return to Merlin, and we cannot be blind to the fact that Rodarchus dies at a suspiciously felicitous time for the poet to bring Ganiada back gracefully to the forest.²⁵ Furthermore, Ganiada displays extraordinary architectural proclivities. Merlin bids her build for him a house in the Caledonian forest:—

Tu quoque saepe veni, soror o dilecte, meamque
Tunc poteris relevare famem potuque ciboque.

Paruit ergo soror, nam iussam condidit aulam
Atque domos alias, et quicquid iusserat illi.²⁶

Moreover, the prophecy that is put into Ganiada's lips²⁵ is so political in its contents that she herself appears to be serving simply as a mouthpiece for utterances that the poet desired to make.²⁶ Her part in the story, resolved into its simplest elements, is that of a woman gifted with prophetic power, who builds a house in the forest for Merlin, supplies him with food and drink, and lives there happily with him.²⁷ This agrees exactly with the part of the fay in a very ordinary type of fairy-mistress story in Celtic and romantic material. A gallant young hero meets a beguiling maiden from the other world, who wins control over him and then builds for him a magic dwelling, where he finds mysterious supplies of food in accordance with his taste, and where his love remains ever

with him, gratifying all his wishes and supplying all his needs.²⁸

It may at first seem strange that if Geoffrey had before him a fairy-mistress story, he should have rationalized and distorted it in the manner indicated by the scattered passages from the *Vita Merlini* that I have noted. But one of the facts with which the student of fairy lore early becomes familiar is that the tendency of other-world material is regularly toward rationalization, and that a fay easily became in narrative a mortal woman gifted with certain unusual powers. Added to this, the *Vita Merlini* is, as I have said above, a heterogeneous poem, and an observation of the author's habitual methods shows that he adopts an independent treatment of popular material, which forbids us to look for a close adherence on his part to the versions that he had before him. In fact we know that Geoffrey in writing his *Historia Regum Britanniae* had cultivated the habit of combining material in a highly original fashion,²⁹ and therefore in a work that there is reason to believe came from his pen, we should expect just such combinations as we find in the *Vita Merlini*.³⁰ The author was in a receptive mood for tradition when he was writing his hexameters, but though he travelled far and wide for much of his material, at times he made some of it go a long way, and thriftily split up the doings of one original among several representatives. We are probably harboring no unjust suspicions, moreover, if we surmise that Geoffrey was governed on this occasion by a deeper reason than the mere pleasure of handling tradition boldly. He wrote the *Vita Merlini* with an eye to the ecclesiastical loaves and fishes at the disposal of Robert de Chesney, Bishop of Lincoln,³¹ and it was

²⁵ See *Perceval le Gallois*, ed. Potvin, Mons, 1866-1871, vv. 22,645-22,781, an episode in which Philipot (*Romania*, xxv, 1896, 286 ff.) finds a parallel to the Merlin and Niniane story; see also *Radcliffe College Monographs*, No. 13, pp. 208 ff.

For fays as builders of castles in romance, cf. also *Perceval le Gallois*, vv. 26,902 ff., 30,369 ff.

²⁶ See Schofield, *Publ. of Modern Language Association*, xvi (1901), 412 ff., 420.

²⁷ For further examples of Geoffrey's treatment of his material in the *Vita Merlini*, see Lot, *Annales de Bretagne*, xv, 338-347; Brown, *Revue Celtique*, xxii, 339 ff.; *Radcliffe College Monographs*, No. 13, pp. 38 ff.

²⁸ See Ward, *Catalogue of Romances*, i, 279-286.

²⁵ See vv. 533-731. ²⁶ Vv. 562 ff. ²⁷ Vv. 1474-1517.

²⁸ See Ward, *Catalogue of Romances*, i, 282; cf. *Romania*, xxii, 510.

²⁷ For an Anglesey tale to the effect that Merlin lived in a wild spot in the woods, where his sister kept house for him, see Rhys, *Hibbert Lectures*, London and Edinburgh, 1888, 159.

doubtless more discreet for him in composing a poem intended to attract a prelate's approval, to slip the fairy-mistress story out of sight under cover of prophetic frenzy, a solicitous sister, and a beautiful but dangerous love abandoned with the follies of youth.

In our only remaining source for early Merlin material beside Geoffrey's writings, namely the Welsh poems dealing with the bard Myrddin, we find nothing against the supposition that Geoffrey was responsible for the transformation of the fairy-mistress theme, and for making Ganiada Merlin's sister. These Welsh poems are of little assistance in an examination of the story with which we are concerned. Only the *Avallenau*³² refers to a love of Myrddin's youth.

"Sweet apple-tree that luxuriantly grows!
Food I used to take at its base to please a fair maid,
When, with my shield on my shoulder, and my sword on
my thigh,
I slept all alone in the woods of Celyddon.

"Sweet apple-tree, which grows by the river-side!
With respect to it, the keeper will not thrive on its
splendid fruit.

While my reason was not aberrant, I used to be around
its stem

With a fair sportive maid, a paragon of slender form.
Ten years and forty, as the toy of lawless ones,
Have I been wandering in gloom and among sprites.³³

In an interpolated text of the *Avallenau*³⁴ mention is made of a maiden with fair hair and pearly teeth, Gloywedd, to whose care the apple-garden is entrusted. These verses certainly give us meagre information, but they imply that with the bard Myrddin there was connected a love theme; furthermore, since we know that the shadow of an apple-tree is a favorite spot for other-world damsels to visit the mortal heroes of their choice, they also suggest that the maiden whom the bard met at the foot of an apple-tree was a fay.³⁵

³² Published with translation by Skene, *The Four Ancient Books of Wales*, Edinburgh, 1868, I, 370 ff., II, 18 ff. The poem is contained in the *Black Book of Caermarthen*, which is dated by Skene (I, 3), probably in the reign of Henry II (cf. Mead, Introduction to *Merlin*, p. cvi); Lot (*Annales de Bretagne*, xv, 506, 507) dates the poem after 1150.

³³ Stanzas IV, VII.

³⁴ Published and translated by San Marte, *Sagen von Merlin*, Halle, 1853, pp. 62-78; see stanza I.

³⁵ Lancelot is found sleeping in the shade of an apple-tree by three fays, who carry him away to a fairy castle,

Neither are the Welsh sources liberal in their remarks about Myrddin's sister, Gwendydd, as they call her. From the *Avallenau* and the *Hoianau*³⁶ we gather that she is the wife of Rydderch, king of the Cambrians, and that her anger has been roused against Myrddin by the death of her son at his hands.³⁷

Gwendydd loves me not, greets me not;
I am hated by the firmest minister of Rydderch;³⁸
I have ruined his son and his daughter.

I am not soothed with diversion, I am not visited by the
fair.

Yet in the battle of Ardderyd golden was my torques,
Though I am now despised by her who is of the color of
swans.³⁹

In the *Kyvoesi*,⁴⁰ or *Dialogue between Myrddin and*

where they unsuccessfully invite him to select one of them for his amie; see Paris, *R. T. R.*, v, 303; *Lancelot*, ed. of 1513, summarized by Sommer, Malory, *Morte Darthur*, London, 1889-1891, III, 179; Malory, Bk. VI, ch. 3, 4; *Roman van Lancelot*, ed. Jonckbloet, The Hague, 1846-1849, I, vv. 13,635 ff. Tam Lin is found asleep under an apple-tree by the Elfin Queen, who takes him to her abode; see Child, *Ballads*, I, 350; cf. 340; IV, 456. See further Paris, *R. T. R.*, III, 326; Hertz, *Spielmannsbuch*, Stuttgart, 1900, p. 359; San Marte, *Sagen von Merlin*, p. 89; Skene, *Four Ancient Books*, II, 336, note on st. iv; Kittredge, *Am. Journ. Phil.*, VII, 190.

³⁶ Published and translated by Skene, *Four Ancient Books*, I, 482 ff.; II, 21 ff. Skene regards the poem as a spurious production, written in imitation of the *Avallenau*; see *Four Ancient Books*, I, 223; cf. Lot, *Annales de Bretagne*, xv, 508; De la Borderie, *L'Historien et le Prophète des Bretons*, Paris, 1884, p. 116.

³⁷ See Skene, *Four Ancient Books*, I, 372, st. vi; 487, st. xv.

³⁸ Lot (*Annales de Bretagne*, xv, 521, note 1) explains these words as referring to Gwendydd.

³⁹ Skene, *Four Ancient Books*, I, 371, st. v.

⁴⁰ Published and translated by Skene, *Four Ancient Books*, I, 462 ff.; II, 218 ff. The poem is divided by Skene into three parts, composed respectively in the seventh, tenth, and twelfth centuries; it is dated by Stephens ca. 1077, by De la Borderie in the twelfth or thirteenth centuries, and by San Marte at an earlier date than the *Hoianau*, even if not than the *Avallenau*; see Lot, *Annales de Bretagne*, xv, 512, 513, for citations of the above authorities, and a statement of their views; *ib.*, 518-520 for arguments in favor of assigning a date later than 1148.

A passing allusion is made to Gwendydd (*Servile is thy cry, thou Gwendydd*) in the *Gwasgardgerdd*, or *Fugitive Poem of Myrddin in his Grave* (Skene, *Four Ancient Books*, I, 481, xxvii), a poem of uncertain date, but regarded probably as belonging no earlier than the last third of the twelfth century; see Lot, *Annales de Bretagne*, xv, 509 ff.

his Sister Gwendydd, Gwendydd addresses Myrddin in flattering terms as her brother, and proceeds to examine him minutely in the history of North Wales.

None of these Welsh poems may with any assurance be said to antedate the *Vita Merlini*, and Lot has called attention to the fact that the influence of the *Vita Merlini* may be recognized in them. "Est-ce à dire que tout dans ces poèmes dérive de Gaufré de Monmouth? Nous ne le pensons pas. Nous croyons au contraire que celui-ci a utilisé d'antiques traditions galloises, écrites ou orales, mais elles ne nous sont pas directement parvenues."⁴¹ The suggestions that I have offered above in regard to Ganiada are altogether in harmony with such a view as this. Although with our present scanty knowledge of the true relation between the historic bard Myrddin and the Merlin of Geoffrey of Monmouth, we are treading here on debatable land, it is not unreasonable to suppose that in so far as the Welsh sources represent Gwendydd, wife of Rydderch, king of the Cambrians, as Myrddin's sister, they are using tradition which was started by Geoffrey's pen,⁴² but that the maiden of the apple-tree doubtless belongs to the same early tradition which we have seen Geoffrey may have altered at his own discretion.

Whether Geoffrey found his story in a *bon lai Breton de Merlin*, such as we hear of in *Renart le Nouvel*,⁴³ we do not know; but of the contents of his original we may form a fairly clear idea. It doubtless told of Merlin's stay with an other-world maiden in a beautiful dwelling that she had herself built for him, of her anger against him because he had deserted her, forgotten her command, or disobeyed her will, of his frenzy at the knowledge that he was under the ban of her displeasure, and, probably, of his restoration by fairy agency to reason and to his loved-one's presence. Every striking alteration that Geoffrey makes in this material may be accounted for by the rationalizing tendency, by the introduction of popular story, by a moulding of the theme to fit the general structure of the poem, by his customary methods and personal aim. The early fairy-mistress story dies out of the extant Merlin ma-

terial, and is succeeded by that of Niniane. Ganiada had been made Merlin's sister by Geoffrey's hand, and thus spoiled for romantic purposes. Under these conditions another fairy-mistress story, belonging to a popular type and developed along different lines, quite naturally took the place of that which Geoffrey had succeeded admirably in distorting.

LUCY ALLEN PATON.

Cambridge, Mass.

PINDAR AND GOETHE.

Although it is almost universally admitted that the influence of Pindar may be traced in Goethe's early lyrics, there is much dispute as to the actual extent of this influence. W. Scherer¹ in referring to Goethe's odes of the years 1772-74 characterizes them as "gräzisierende Oden" and speaks of "gewaltsam schwungvoller Vortrag Pindarischer Gesänge." Loeper² finds the Pindaric influence manifested in *Wanderers Sturmlied* and in *Adler und Taube*. Düntzer admits³ it only in *Wanderers Sturmlied*. A. Michaelis⁴ believes that the poetical form of *Wanderers Sturmlied*, *Prometheus*, *Harzreise*, and *Ganymed* was derived from Pindar. The conclusions of Minor and Sauer,⁵ who have given the most exhaustive discussion of the subject, may be summed up in the following four statements: 1, Goethe took Pindar, as he understood him, for his model in his odes *Wanderers Sturmlied* and *Adler und Taube*; 2, The diction of these odes is derived in part from Pindar; 3, Goethe borrowed from Pindar the run-on-line (enjambement) at the end of a stanza; 4, Pindar and Herder were the first to give him a clear conception of the importance of technical mastery of language for poetic purposes. We shall have occasion often to return to this treatise; it is again and again referred to as authoritative on the question at issue and on Goethe's early relations to Herder (cf. Weissenfels, *Goethe in St. u. Dr.*, 1894, p. 140, foot-note; R.

¹ *Geschichte der deutsch. Lit.*, 5. ed., 1885, p. 488.

² *Goethe's Gedichte*, 2d. part, 1883, pp. 320-21, 325.

³ *Erläuterungen z. d. deutsch. Klassikern*, vol. 70-72, 1876, p. 321 ff.

⁴ "Goethe u. d. Antike" in *Strassb. Goethevorträge*, 1899, p. 121.

⁵ *Studien zur Goethe-Philologie*, 1880, pp. 42, 82-84, 99 ff., 102.

⁴¹ *Annales de Bretagne*, xv, 520.

⁴² Cf. *Ib.*, 520, 521, 533.

⁴³ See *Roman de Renart*, ed. Méon, Paris, 1826, II, vv. 2149, 2150.

Meyer's Goethe biography, 2d. ed., p. 721) and may therefore be considered as practically new in spite of its having been published more than twenty years ago.

As is apparent from the foregoing the commentators are agreed only on one point, namely that the ode *Wanderers Sturmlied* was effected by Pindar; they disagree as to the particular manner. There can be no doubt that it is extremely difficult to disentangle the genuine Pindaric elements in this ode. Loeper finds only two correspondences with Pindar: 1, in ll. 71-75 (praise of "Jupiter Pluvius"); 2, in ll. 101 ff. (allusion to the Greek games and to Pindar); on the other hand he points out that ll. 1, 18 ff., 97, 102 are suggestive of Horace. Even if we consider that Pindar is twice mentioned (ll. 56, 109), the similarities between *Wanderers Sturmlied* and the odes of Pindar are slight, and numerically there are fewer adaptations from Pindar than from Horace. Further considerations will tend to weaken their significance. Goethe may have borrowed the idea of "Jupiter Pluvius" and the corresponding one of the "sturmathmende Gottheit" (l. 91) from Homer and Klopstock as well as from Pindar. In Pindar Zeus is in the first place the hurler of lightnings and the thunderer, while the view that he is the God of the storm and rain is only of secondary importance. In Klopstock on the other hand the idea of the presence of God in the storm is essential;⁶ besides the pantheism implied in "Der du mich fassend deckst, Jupiter Pluvius" (l. 82-83) is more characteristic of Klopstock⁷ than of Pindar.

The only possible relation between *Wanderers Sturmlied* and the odes of Pindar must therefore be sought for in its general thought and in its form. As to the form Goethe might have found a suggestion in Pindar as he was conceived by the conventional literary criticism of the day; this ideal of Pindar appears, for instance, in Klopstock's ode *An meine Freunde*, ll. 5-8:

"Willst du zu Strophen werden, o Lied? oder
Ununterwürfig, Pindars Gesängen gleich,
Gleich Zeus erhabnem trunknem Sohne,
Frey aus der schaffenden Sel enttaumeln."

⁶ See below.

⁷ This idea is entirely compatible with the theism of Klopstock.

This imitation of a fictitious Pindar may have occurred; but even then Pindar would have been to Goethe only the exponent of poetical ideals with which Goethe was already imbued from other sources. At any rate the real, historic Pindar cannot have been the model for *Wanderers Sturmlied*. This is born out by the following points.

A characteristic feature of the poem is the fact that a number of lines begin with the same word (cf. ll. 5-6, 16-17, 19-21, 26-27, 34-36, 46-48, 72-74, etc.). Pindar has no such repetitions, whereas they are common in the Anacreontic school, especially Gleim, and in Goethe's own earlier poems.—Note further the use of the apostrophe to "Genius" and to "Jupiter Pluvius" which runs through the poem. A direct apostrophe to Zeus is seldom found in Pindar; the Olympian and Pythean odes contain only four cases (4., 5., 13. Ol., 1. Pyth. odes), and even then the apostrophe consists only of a short prayer for some divine favor. Pindar addresses his odes to princes, prominent citizens and especially to the victors whom he praises. One might of course assert that Goethe may have developed his use of apostrophe from the one found in Pindar; but this would be a rather far-fetched explanation. On the other hand, apostrophe to God and the Redeemer is very frequent in Klopstock.—More striking results are furnished by the study of the sentence-structure in the ode. The style shows a remarkable syntactical monotony, since independent clauses in the present indicative or imperative prevail. Sometimes the sentences fairly shrink to a telegram style. This enables the poet by joining together an indefinite number of chiefly co-ordinate clauses to form agglomerations of sentences of almost any length; and there is no inner reason why their close should, as is the case, coincide with the end of a stanza. It is apparent that this structure of sentences is the very opposite of the one found in Pindar, while it is exactly that for which Klopstock shows a strong predilection.

One could try to meet all these objections to an assumed influence of Pindar on Goethe by the remark: *Wanderers Sturmlied* may not show Pindaric form, but it certainly represents Pindar's ideas. This, however, is still less the case. As a rule Pindar's odes present the same sequence of thought touching chiefly upon these three points:

1. mention and praise of the person to whom the ode is dedicated; 2. eulogy of his family, if it has already gained some fame; 3. mythological allusions and references to contemporary events.⁸ Of this only mythological allusions are found in *Wanderers Sturmlied*. Pindar's narrative is objective. *Wanderers Sturmlied*, on the other hand, is intensely subjective; it is the expression of Goethe's sublime egotism. To explain this chief characteristic of the ode we have to go back either to Herder or to Klopstock, or else we must derive it from Goethe's own nature; egotism is foreign to Pindar.

There are other things in the ode which remind us not unfrequently of Klopstock. I would connect l. 1 with Klopstock's *Lehrling der Griechen*, l. 1, rather than with Horace, *Carm.* iv, 3, l. 1; Klopstock uses the word "Genius" while Horace uses "Melpomene." "Der du mich fassend deckst, Jupiter Pluvius" (l. 82-83) reminds one of "Allgegenwärtig, Vater, schliessest du mich ein" (*Dem Allgegenwärtigen*, l. 21-22); it must be noted that in this same poem of Klopstock the idea of the presence of God in the storm is found (ll. 39-40). Loeper remarks⁹ on this passage: "Im Preise des Wettergotts, der sturmthmenden Gottheit, des Jupiter Pluvius, wetteifert Goethe hier mit Pindar." But this praise of Zeus is for Pindar rather incidental. Moreover, it must be noted that for him Zeus is in the first place the hurler of lightnings and the thunderer (9. Ol. 6; 11. Ol. 83-84). On the other hand, the idea that God is present in the roaring storm is fundamental in Klopstock (*Dem Allgegenwärtigen*, ll. 37-44, 69-72. *Der Abschied*, ll. 5-9. *Frühlingsfeier*, ll. 57-60, 105 ff.). "Dich strömt mein Lied" (l. 76) finds a parallel in "So strömt der Gesang, Thuiskon, deines Geschlechts" (*Aganippe und Phiala*, l. 9-10); "strömen" is very frequent in Klopstock. *Schauer Mitternacht, schweben, Seligkeit, quellen, sterblich* may be considered as especially characteristic of Klopstock. The expression "Ceder" is not found in Pindar; Klopstock uses the word in *Dem Allmächtigen*, l. 72; *Die Glückseligkeit aller*, l. 8, and in *Messias*.

The word and idea of "Genius" certainly is not

⁸ Now and then reflections of a general nature are inserted.

⁹ *Goethes Ged.*, etc., p. 320.

derived from Pindar. Although "Genius" here may be interpreted as meaning a phase of Goethe's own personality, his poetical faculty, yet Goethe addresses it as a guiding spirit. Do we not find a parallel to the first stanzas of *Wanderers Sturmlied* in the first stanzas of Klopstock's *Stunden der Weihe*? In the latter Klopstock appeals to the quiet hours of evening not to depart without their blessing; he has the vision of one of the heavenly host saying:

"Eilt, heilige Stunden, die ihr die Unterwelt
Aus diesen hohen Pforten Gottes
Selten besuchet, zu jenem Jüngling,
Der Gott, den Mittler, Adams Geschlecht singt!
Deckt ihn mit dieser schattigen kühlen Nacht
Der goldnen Flügel, dass er einsam
Unter dem himmlischen Schatten dichte."

This order is obeyed. The situation in the ode is: Klopstock feels himself under the protection of the twilight hours; he believes theirs to be the credit of his odes (ll. 13-16). Compare this with the beginning of *Wanderers Sturmlied*, where the "Genius" takes the place of the hours in *Stunden d. W.* The parallel becomes still more evident if we consider ll. 71-75, in which Goethe expresses the belief of being Jupiter's *Sänger*, and remember that Klopstock's *Stunden d. W.* bore in the Darmstadt edition of 1771 the heading: "Als der Dichter den Messias zu singen unternahm," and also that Goethe is supposed to have written the ode while returning from his stay among the admirers of Klopstock at Darmstadt.

Pindar had no important nor even considerable influence on *Wanderers Sturmlied*. We have in this ode a poem in which reminiscences of Goethe's reading in the classics and in Klopstock are combined with genuine Storm and Stress impulses to unique effect.

Many of the foregoing remarks hold good also for the poem *Adler und Taube*. Minor and Sauer maintain¹⁰ that it is half Pindaric half Anacreontic. They refer to the eagle of *Adler und Taube* as the representative of loftiness and strength of character and the bird of Zeus, as which he frequently occurs in Pindar. But the eagle has always been the symbol of such qualities. The contrasting of eagle and dove is absent in Pindar, who sets against each other eagle and

¹⁰ *Studien*, etc., 50.

raven (2. Ol., 96), and eagle and crow (3. Nem., 76 ff.); it is, however, found in the Anacreontic school and in Horace, *Carm.* iv, 4 (ll. 31-32). Repetitions of the same word at the beginning of successive lines are less numerous, but not entirely wanting (cf. ll. 20-21, 37-39, 48-49). The style is fluent; the diction reminds one of the Anacreontics and of Klopstock (*Jüngling, wandeln, allgegenwärtig, tieftrauernd, tiefernt, etc.*). The leading thought, namely, the idea that the genius needs another sphere of life and activity than the *Philister*, is certainly not traceable to Pindar. Pindar is so absolutely the man of a sound, cheerful, sober philosophy of life that he ranks much more with the Anacreontics than with Storm and Stress. He recommends serenity and contentment with a humble lot; he praises the life of the middle classes compared with that of the tyrants. He admonishes the unfortunate ones to bear their sorrows with equanimity; in no case whatsoever is man to give up all hope. Melancholy resignation is foreign to Pindar. Cf. 2. Pyth., 93:¹¹ "It avails to bear lightly the yoke placed on our necks." 3. Pyth., 107: "Moderate in moderate fortune, great in great will I be; the bliss that befalls me I will cherish in mind, improving it to my best." 11. Pyth. 52: "For since in the commonweal I find the middle state bloom with bliss the most lasting, I despise the lot of sovereigns." 3. Pyth. 81:¹² "For one good the immortals give to men two evils: but these fools have not power to bear in moderation; not so the wise, who turn to view the good in all things." Pindar's principles apparently correspond much more with those of the dove than with those of the eagle. Furthermore the downfall of the eagle in the poem is described with more length and detail than required by the symbolic character of the fable; Goethe admires in the wounded hero the tragical beauty of fallen greatness. This idea would never have appealed to Pindar; his object always is living vigor and courage.

Of less importance to the question at issue is

¹¹ Transl. from *The odes of Pindar in English Prose*, Oxford, 1824.

¹² The number of sentences in Pindar which are opposed to Storm and Stress view could easily be multiplied. Pindar conceives especially no titanic defiance of the gods (cf. 5. Isthm. 14; 6. Isthm. 43 ff.).

the run-on-line touched upon by Minor and Sauer. They maintain,¹³ as above stated, that Goethe took over from Pindar the *enjambement* at the end of a stanza, but that he did not imitate Pindar's use of dividing a word between the end of one line and the beginning of the next, although this is, as they assert, common in Pindar. Neither of the two statements seems to be quite correct. If we distinguish between strophic, linear (Zeilen-) and verbal (Wort-) *enjambement*, then matters are very clear regarding the first two cases. Goethe makes no use of strophic *enjambement*, while he frequently uses linear *enjambement*. He does not use the first, although it is not unfrequently found in Pindar; on the other hand he did not need any model for the latter, since linear *enjambement* is found in his poems of the Leipzig and Strassburg periods.

It is not quite correct to say that verbal *enjambement* is common in Pindar. The metrical unit in his odes within the stanza is the *πούς* (*περίοδος*). If each *πούς* is printed as a separate line, then we have in Pindar not unfrequent verbal *enjambements*; on the other hand if one prints the *πόδες* which belong together as one line, then Pindar's odes never show verbal *enjambement*. The latter practice is almost generally adopted in the editions published in the latter half of the nineteenth century, while the editions used by Goethe contained, as it seems, short lines with frequent verbal *enjambement*. Goethe, however, did not follow Pindar in this respect.

Little need be said concerning another statement made by Minor und Sauer. If Herder and Pindar really were the men who convinced Goethe of the importance of linguistic perfection for poetry, then they could at best boast of having revived in the poet's mind a principle which he had temporarily lost sight of. For an exaggerated appreciation of the formal element in poetry as regards both style and metre was one of the chief characteristics of the Anacreontic school, whose disciple Goethe still was in his early Strassburg days. It is true, Goethe writes to Herder in July, 1772: "Ueber den Worten Pindar's *ἐνικπαρεῖν δύνασθαι* ist mir's aufgegangen." But one must remember that Goethe refers here chiefly to the "Grund meines spechtigen Wesens;" besides, the-

¹³ *Studien*, etc., 102.

letter gives the impression of having been written by a pupil who wants to please his teacher.

The prime agent of Goethe's lyrical development between the Strassburg and Wetzlar periods were not the classics; it was probably Klopstock. His influence upon *Elysium*, *Felsweihesang* and *Pilgers Morgenlied* is universally recognized. He is, as has been seen above, in part responsible for *Wanderers Sturmlied*. His influence is perhaps traceable also in Goethe's *Seefahrt*, the poem being the positive counterpart of Klopstock's *Die Welten*, ll. 21—end. Only Goethe's later didactic odes, *Das Göttliche* and *Grenzen der Menschheit* show real parallels to Pindar; cf. *Grenzen d. M.*, ll. 1-6 with Pindar's view of Zeus as the hurler of lightnings, and *ibid.* ll. 11-13 with 6. Isthm. 43 ff. *Harzreise* ll. 6-18 remind us of Pindar's fatalism. But it is hard to say whether we have here real Pindaric reminiscences.

The foregoing opinion of the effect of Pindar upon Goethe seems to be totally disproved by Goethe's letters of 1771-72 in which he expresses great admiration of Pindar. But the more one studies these letters, especially those addressed to Herder, the more one is impressed with their unnatural character. Partly they seem to have been written to please Herder, partly they seem to exhibit a slightly turbulent state of mind in their author at the time of their composition. It is not improbable that Goethe hastily glanced through Pindar for Herder's sake. How much Herder impelled Goethe to read can be inferred from the *Ephemerides* and from Goethe's letters; the result of this activity was, as Goethe writes in the above-mentioned letter to Herder: "Es geht bei mir noch alles entsetzlich durcheinander." To make a thorough study of Pindar would hardly have been possible for Goethe during the busy autumn and winter months of 1771-72; and Pindar is not a poet to captivate upon cursory reading.

PAUL REIFF.

Univ. of Wisconsin.

TWO SONNETS HITHERTO UNNOTICED.

The practical disappearance of the Sonnet in English literature from about 1658 to 1750 has been discussed by many authorities. It has been frequently stated that William Walsh wrote the

only sonnet during that period that has survived. In Ward's *English Poets*, III, 7, Mr. Gosse says, "Walsh is the author of the only sonnet written in English between Milton's, in 1658, and Warton's, about 1750." Mr. Gosse characteristically forgot a sonnet he had edited himself, the famous one by Gray, written in 1742. T. S. Perry, in his admirable and scholarly work, *English Literature in the Eighteenth Century*, makes the more guarded statement, that "Walsh is one of the few men who wrote sonnets in English between Milton and the Wartons" (p. 224, note). In the latest book published on English verse, Professor R. M. Alden's *English Verse*, 1903, an excellent manual and textbook, nothing is added to our information on this particular point. In the *Beginnings of the English Romantic Movement*, 1893, I first called attention to the prominent part played by Thomas Edwards in the revival of the sonnet, and in later impressions, I added a note (page 46) that I had discovered two sonnets of Edwards, dated 1746 and 1747 respectively.

I have recently had the good fortune to discover two sonnets that fall in this barren period, which add another author to the very scanty list. These sonnets, while devoid of intrinsic poetic merit, are in the regular Shaksperian form, and are by the notorious wit and courtly poet, Sir Charles Sedley. It is impossible to assign the exact year when they were composed, but as Sedley was about twenty-one years old in 1660, and died in 1701, they must have been written in what is loosely called the Restoration period. The two sonnets appear on pages 60 and 91 respectively of Sedley's *Poetical Works*, London, 1707. The first is entitled, *To Cæsus*.

O Times! O Manners! *Cicero* cry'd out,
But 'twas when enrag'd *Catilin* conspir'd
To burn the City, and to cut the Throat
Of half the Senate, had his Ruffians hir'd:

When Son and Father did the World divide,
And *Rome* for Tyrants, not for Empire fought;
When slaughter'd Citizens on either side
Cover'd that Earth, her early Valour bought.

Of Times and Men, why dost thou now complain?
What is it, *Cæsus*, that offends thee, say?
Our Laws the License of the Sword restrain;
And our Prince wills that his arm'd Troops obey:
His Reign, Success, Freedom and Plenty crown,
Blame not our Manners then, but mend thy own.

The second is entitled, *To Quintus*.

Thou art an Atheist, *Quintus*, and a Wit,
Think'st all was of self-moving Atoms made,
Religion only for the Vulgar fit,
Priests Rogues, and Preaching their deceitful Trade;
Wilt drink, whore, fight, blaspheme, damn, curse and swear:
Why wilt thou swear, by G—, if there be none?
And if there be, thou shoul'd'st his Vengeance fear:
Methinks this Huffing might be let alone;
'Tis thou art free, Mankind besides a Slave,
And yet a Whore may lead thee by the Nose,
A drunken Bottle, and a flatt'ring Knave,
A mighty Prince, Slave to thy dear Son's Foes,
Thy Lust, thy Rage, Ambition and thy Pride,
He that serves G—, need nothing serve beside.

The above two sonnets must therefore be added to the meagre collection written between Milton and the Wartons.

WM. LYON PHELPS.

Yale University.

"YEOMAN'S SERVICE."

This phrase is very commonly used for "eminent" or "efficient service," and so the dictionaries explain it. It has been preserved, I suppose, in the current language by the passage in *Hamlet*, where the prince, explaining how he was able to forge letters as if from the Danish Chancery, says that his fair handwriting, of which he had been ashamed, on this occasion "did me yeoman's service." The commentators on Shakespeare, so far as I have consulted them, concur in the explanation, "eminent service," but give no instance of its use with that meaning.

I venture to think that this is not the correct explanation of the phrase. Yeoman's service was the feudal service to which a yeoman, or freeman below a knight, was held. It was below a knight's service, and above a villein's service. The knight was bound to assist his lord in war with arms, a horse, and a stipulated number of retainers: the yeoman, holding lands under a knight, was bound to attend him in war with bow and arrows. Chaucer's Yeman, in attendance on the Knight, shows the type.

"Yeoman's service," then, as used by Hamlet, I understand to mean not "eminent," but "humble but useful service," rendered him at a pinch by an art in itself despicable.

I am confirmed in this view by the fact that Shakespeare never uses "yeoman," but with a note of disparagement, as in contrast to a "gentleman."

WM. HAND BROWNE.

Johns Hopkins University.

ENGLISH VERSIFICATION.

English Verse, Specimens illustrating its principles and history. Chosen and edited by RAYMOND M. ALDEN, Ph. D. Henry Holt & Company, New York, 1903. 16mo., pp. xiv + 459.

Books on English versification are numerous enough, it would seem, to satisfy every need, but somehow they all deal with the history of metrical forms and their classification, without paying much heed to the beginner's question about the rhetorical effectiveness of given forms for given purposes. Professor Alden's *English Verse* is doubly welcome, because it does try to answer this question about effectiveness, and because it furnishes in convenient, and for the most part undogmatic, arrangement, an unusual quantity of material for a book of its size. This material consists of illustrative passages in great number, arranged, for each point, in chronological order, and long enough to give a fair notion of what they illustrate. In addition to these illustrations, is a surprising number of brief comments by various critics, gathered (a sentence or two at a time) from a wide field, and most of them *obiter dicta* that would escape the ordinary student of versification. The references to dissertations and essays, while confessedly incomplete, are numerous enough to stimulate the curiosity and disturb the self-complacency of the student. Indeed, the chronological arrangement of the illustrations, and the number of references, form the chief value of the book to the beginner. It is, perhaps, to be regretted that the author has not expressed his own opinion more frequently and positively, for his modesty sometimes leads us to wonder if he has not trusted too implicitly to his authorities, and not enough to his own investigations.

Part I treats of Accent and Time, the Foot and the Verse, the Stanza, and Tone-Quality (Assonance, Alliteration, and Rime); Part II, of the more important forms, such as the Heroic Couplet,

Blank Verse, and the Sonnet; Part III, of the Time-Element in English Verse; and Part IV (of the Place and Function of the Metrical Element in English Poetry) consists of over twenty pages in fine print of extracts from a baker's dozen of writers from Aristotle to Gummere.

The following notes are meant as suggestions for a second edition.

P. 33. The line from Milton's Ode, "Can no more divine," is cited as "an instance of a verse truncated at the beginning—rare in modern English poetry." Professor Alden, like most others, assumes that truncated lines are trochaic, whereas from their structure they may be either trochaic or iambic, and (as the reviewer hopes sometime to show) are used most often in iambic measures.

On p. 76, it is reported of the stanza of the *In Memoriam*: "Tennyson is indeed said to have invented it for his own use, not knowing of its earlier appearances." In the *Memoir*, I, 305-6, Tennyson says: "And as for the metre of 'In Memoriam' I had no notion until 1880 that Lord Herbert of Cherbury had written his occasional verses in the same metre. I believed myself the originator of the metre until after 'In Memoriam' came out, when someone told me that Ben Jonson and Sir Philip Sidney had used it."

On p. 85, the reference to p. 106 should be to p. 111; and reference might also be made to p. 133.

On p. 94, to Milton's poem in rime royal stanza with concluding alexandrine, might be added Wordsworth's *Resolution and Independence* in 20 stanzas, written in 1802. The rime royal rime-scheme is found in four-beat lines in Carew's *In the Person of a Lady to her inconstant Lover* (1640); in four-beat anapests in Shelley's *On an icicle that clung to the grass of a grave*; and in 5524335 (ababbcc) in Suckling's *Unjust Decrees* (1646)—where the first stanza rimes abbc.

P. 97. Chaucer's ababbcbc stanza occurs in a 15th century French version of the *Debate between the Body and the Soul* (*Latin Poems attrib. to W. Mapes*, p. 310 f.).

P. 107. Even more interesting than Phineas Fletcher's curious stanza are Hood's *Plea of the Midsummer Fairies*, a Spenserian stanza with the ninth line a pentameter; and Shelley's *Lines written in Dejection*, where the first eight lines are four-beat, and the ninth is an alexandrine.

P. 132. The stanza quoted from *Ye Nutbrowne Maide* as showing "a somewhat complex system of internal rime" is only an aabccb stanza printed as a couplet.

In the section on the Sonnet, Professor Alden quotes Sharp's Ten Commandments of the Sonnet, number three of which says that a "rimed couplet at the close is allowable only when the form is the English or Shakespearian (p. 269)." Out of 1273 sonnets conforming to the Italian rime-scheme in the octave, 353, or 27.72 per cent, end the sestet with a couplet.

P. 280. 196 of Wordsworth's 519 sonnets rime abbaacca in the octave.

P. 282. Of Shelley's eleven sonnets, one (*To the Nile*) is regular in form (abbaabbaacddede).

P. 286. Tennyson's sonnets number 30, not 19.

P. 291. Only three of the sonnets to *Delia* are Italian (Nos. 33 and 35, and No. 2 of the 'rejected' ones).

P. 293. The sonnets in Spenser's *Amoretti* number only 89 (in Grosart's ed., in Globe ed., 88); and only one (no. 8) is in the Surrey form, not 56. Although the Spenserian sonnet has "never been adopted by other poets," one of Constable's *Diana* sequence was Spenserian, and four of Daniel's to *Delia* (Nos. 20, 22, 32, 53); and three more show its influence (23 rimes ababcbcbdbbdee; 25 rimes ababcbcbdbbdeff; and 51 rimes ababcbcbdbbdeff). See also Shakespeare's no. 55.

P. 294. Slight irregularities in the rime-schemes of Shakespeare's sonnets are also found in nos. 3, 6, 24, 29, 44, 45, 51, 90, 96, 97, 125, 133, 134, and 136.

Section V, on Odes, fails to mention Keats's Odes, even to explain their omission on account of their regular stanza form.

P. 360. 53 out of 55 ballades rime ababbcbc (which, by the way, may be either the origin of, or the development of, the *Monk's Tale* stanza).

P. 367. In addition to the ballade in 10-line stanzas, there is one in 9-line stanzas, by W. E. Henley (*Of Aspiration*); there are also a half-dozen variations in the rime-scheme of the 10-line stanzas, with envoys of either five or six lines, in all sorts of line-length. There are, too, at least three varieties of ballade in 11-line stanzas, and a curious one in a 12-line stanza, by W. E. Henley (*Of Truisms*).

The table illustrating the history of the Heroic Couplet is unfortunately based upon passages of only 100 lines for each author—too short to tell anything with reasonable certainty. Professor Mayor's table (*Chapters on Eng. Metre*, p. 208), based on passages of 200 lines each (which shows as great differences between Tennyson's own poems, for instance, as between Milton and Browning) should have shown the futility of basing general statements on such slight evidence. A count of the 3108 lines in the *Prologue* and *Knight's Tale*, gives 13.1 per cent. of run-on; of the 1622 lines in those of Waller's poems which are over 100 lines long, gives 15.78 per cent.; of the 2427 lines of Dryden's *Palamon and Arcite*, gives 11.74 per cent.; of 1954 lines in Pope (*Ess. on Crit., Windsor Forest, and Iliad I*) gives 8.90 per cent.; of the 2019 lines in Books I and II of *Endymion*, gives 52.30 per cent.; and of the 3036 lines of Books I to III of *Sordello*, gives 59.68 per cent. Professor Alden's results for Chaucer, Pope, and Keats are seriously misleading.

Of run-on couplets, there are, in the same passages, in Chaucer, 6 per cent.; in Waller, 1.6 per cent.; in Dryden, .074 per cent.; in Pope, .02 per cent.; in Keats, 28 per cent.; and in Browning, 28.7 per cent.

The figures for substitutions of feet can hardly be freed from the personal equation, even in the case of anapests. Dr. G. D. Brown's dissertation on *Syllabification and Accent in Paradise Lost* (Johns Hopkins University, 1901) shows pretty conclusively that we have in English a great many "unstable iambs," which may easily fit into either iambic or trochaic rhythms, and which are likely, to many, to make very good spondees, or pyrrhics.

EDWARD PAYSON MORTON.

Indiana University.

OLD FRENCH LANGUAGE.

Einführung in das Studium der Altfranzösischen Sprache. Zum Selbstunterricht für den Anfänger, von Dr. CARL VORETZSCH. Pp. xvi + 258. Halle, 1901.

Of this little volume I believe it can be said that it fills a long felt want. Many excellent manuals of historical French Grammar have been

published, but it may be objected to most of them that they are too technical, not being written for beginners, and presuppose a previous training such as is not possessed by the average student entering upon the study of Old French. I make this statement based upon my own experience and observation.

Dr. Voretzsch has written this book primarily for beginners, wishing, as he says,

"dem anfänger ein buch in die hand zu geben, das wirklich nichts anderes voraussetzt als das latein und französisch, das er auf der schule gelernt hat, ein buch, das geeignet sein soll, ihn mit einer anzahl häufig gebrauchter wortformen und sonstiger eigentümlichkeiten des altfranzösischen vertraut zu machen, ihn in die grundbegriffe sowie in die haupttatsachen der sprachlichen entwicklung einzuführen und zum verständnis eines leichteren altfranzösischen textes anzuleiten."

The general plan of the work is set forth in the opening lines of the preface:

"Das vorliegende lehrbuch ist aus praktischen übungen hervorgegangen. Seine veröffentlichung verfolgt den zweck, dem anfänger, welchem sich solche elementare übungen nicht bieten, dieselbe zu ersetzen und ihm diejenigen kenntnisse mitzuteilen, vermöge deren er einer systematischen vorlesung über altfranzösische oder historische grammatik oder einer textinterpretation mit besserem verständnis zu folgen vermag als es ohne solche vorkenntnisse möglich wäre."

As material for carrying out this plan in detail, Dr. Voretzsch has taken vv. 1-258, 812-870 of the '*Pèlerinage de Charlemagne*' and has made the first thirty-one verses the subject of a thorough analysis, deriving therefrom and formulating rules covering all phases of the historical development of Old French. For this purpose the poem selected is admirably suited, standing as it does upon the threshold between the older stage of the language and the most flourishing period of its literature. By occasionally citing parallel Italian and Provençal forms a comparison between the various dialects is instituted and preparation made for entering into the broader field of Romance Philology.

Since the book is intended for such as are studying without the guidance of a teacher, thoroughness has been sought after throughout, but without going into minute details, which would be manifestly out of place in an elementary text-book. The method of presentation is a combination of

analysis and synthesis, the author's purpose being to meet the possible objection "als ob diese induktive methode nur dazu gut sei, einen haufen ungeordneter und zufällig vereigneter regeln vor augen zu führen."

The book is divided into four parts. Part I is devoted to the analysis of vv. 1-31. At first every word is taken up, its etymology explained and the principles governing its changes are stated and illustrated by examples taken from the text under consideration. The intermediate steps in the transformation of a word and their dates have received due attention. The author has not stopped with a word at the stage it occupies in the '*Pèlerinage*,' but has followed its development into modern French. A few remarks on Versification are given on pp. 65-67. A fuller treatment of this subject would have been desirable. A pleasing feature of the book is the attention given to pronunciation, the words being transcribed to show the Old-French pronunciation of the period, this in contrast to the practice usually followed in similar manuals, where the pronunciation is more or less neglected.

Part II (pp. 126-157), gives briefly a systematic survey of the sound-changes observed in Part I. The general principles of linguistic change as applicable to the subject are here discussed, including Accentuation, which is admirably treated on pp. 142-147.

Part III (pp. 158-206), continues the analysis of the text on the basis of what has preceded. The translation of the text is now dispensed with and the student is referred to the glossary for the meaning of words, explanations being given only of forms and constructions not covered by principles already laid down.

Part IV contains an account of the phonology of Old French, *scil.* the '*Francien*,' its Morphology, and Syntax, in so far as the forms and their relations are exhibited in the text under consideration.

In examining the present work I have been favorably impressed above all by the exceedingly clear and lucid presentation of the facts and by what seems to me the sound pedagogical principles which mark the entire book. I do not pretend to be '*Romaniste*' enough to speak with any degree of authority on the subject of French Phonetics. I wish, however, to call attention to a

few points, which I think Dr. Voretzsch has not explained as satisfactorily as he might.

P. 23: Rule: "Nach stimmlosen dentalen (*s, t*) verstummt hiatus-*u*." This is of course true, but it is also true that this vowel in common with other hiatus vowels is either dropped or undergoes a change, this occurring after other consonants than *s, t*.¹ Hence the rule may be misleading or insufficient. The whole subject of hiatus might well have been discussed here.

P. 47: After saying that "Der vortonvocal (im nebenton) . . . zeigt eine schwächung von *o* zu *e*, die aber nur vor folgendem *n* oder *m* eintritt," the author gives the rule: "Vortoniges (nebetoniges) *o* vor nasal wird zu *e*," and cites the examples **truncate*—**troncare* > *trenchier*, *honorem* > *enor* besides *onor*, *Runcias valles*—*Roncesvals* > *Rencesvals*. To give this as the rule and explain the other far more numerous instances where *o* in similar position remains, as due to analogy, and that *o* remains unchanged also when its syllable is felt as an independent part, does not seem to dispose of the matter properly. Pretonic *o* is weakened to *e* before other combinations than those given by the author.² Other vowels in like position are also weakened to *e*.³ Nyrop calls such forms exhibiting a change of *on* to *an* "cas isolés . . . probablement dialectales."⁴ *O* to *e* in *honorem* > *enor* is better explained as dissimilation.⁴ The point is perhaps a difficult one, but Dr. Voretzsch's rule will in my opinion tend rather to confuse than to aid the student, since it covers but a small number of cases of this class that will come under his observation later.

P. 84, *espier*: Explaining the development of Germ. diphthong *eo*—*eu* in *feudu* > *fief*, and Lat. *eu* in *meum* > *mien*, *Deum* > *Dieu*, no reason is here given for the different changes of *meum* to *mien* and *Deum* to *Deu*, *Dieu*.⁵ It might also have been well to account for the later development of *speot* to *épieu*.⁵

¹ Nyrop, Kr., *Grammaire historique de la langue française*, I, §§ 137, 262, 452; Schwan, E., *Grammatik des Altfranzösischen*, III. Auflage, neu bearbeitet von D. Behrens, § 327.

² Brachet, *Historical Grammar of the French Language* tr. P. Toynbee, § 65.

³ Brachet, *op. cit.*, § 199, ff.

⁴ Nyrop, *op. cit.*, §§ 184, 223, 512; cf. Schwan, *op. cit.*, 97, Meyer-Lübke, *Gram. d. Rom. Spr.*, I, §§ 358, 359.

⁵ Nyrop, *op. cit.*, §§ 165, 526; Schwan, *op. cit.*, § 51.

The Glossary gives the words occurring in the text, except pronouns and the forms found in the paradigms of inflection, pp. 221-238. The etymology is either given here briefly or reference is made to the line in the body of the book where the form is discussed more fully. The following words have been omitted from the Glossary: *baisier* (*baisast*, 826), *bandon*, 852, *barnage*, 206, 219, 804, *barnet*, 820, 829, *ber*, 814, 858, 864, *hui*, 804, *laenz*, 114, *membre* (*membret*, *impers.*, 234), *mi* (*enmi* is given, but not *parmi*, 102), *on*, 846, 850.

The text itself shows a number of readings different from those of Koschwitz,⁶ but in a work of this kind textual criticism has no place and may be left out of consideration.

Appended is a brief bibliography of works relating to the '*Karlreise*.'

NILS FLATEN.

St. Olaf College.

VOLTAIRE.

Shakespeare and Voltaire. By THOMAS R. LOUNSBURY, L.H.D., LL.D. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1902.

This book is Professor Lounsbury's second in the series of *Shakespearean Wars*. In the first, *Shakespeare as a Dramatic Artist*, he showed that Shakespeare's rejection of the unities was deliberate, and not the result of ignorance; in the present work he treats of the conflict to which this disregard of Classic principles gave rise in the eighteenth century. This conflict was especially brisk in France, and the head and front of the opposition was Voltaire.

The book is timely. We know that Voltaire once wrote a letter to the Academy on the subject of Shakespeare, and that he referred to him as a drunken savage. But no one before Professor Lounsbury, I think, has collected the various remarks of Voltaire on the subject, or traced the growth of his hatred through fifty years.

The plan of the book is chronological. It begins with Voltaire's visit to England in 1626, when he learned English, and saw Shakespeare on the stage.

⁶ *Karls des Grossen Reise nach Jerusalem und Constantinopel*, herausgegeben von Dr. E. Koschwitz, III. Auflage, 1895.

How many plays he saw we do not know, but it seems certain that *Hamlet* and *Julius Cæsar* at least were among the number. Besides these he knew *Othello* and *Macbeth*, as *Zaire* and *Mahomet* subsequently proved, and he cites single scenes from *Lear*, *Antony and Cleopatra*, *Romeo and Juliet*, *Richard II*, *Richard III*, *Henry IV*, *Henry V*, and *Troilus and Cressida*. That he knew these very imperfectly is certain; that he knew anything whatever about the others is very doubtful; and no word that he ever wrote refers to Shakespeare as an author of comedies.

Voltaire's first impression on seeing Shakespeare's plays was that he had discovered a treasure, and he paid the great dramatist the sincere compliment of imitation. Professor Lounsbury draws damaging parallels between *Othello* and *Zaire*, between *Julius Cæsar* and *La Mort de Cæsar*, *Macbeth* and *Mahomet*, *Hamlet* and *Sémiramis*. In the prefaces of which Voltaire was so prodigal he neglected to give the sources of his inspiration, save in *La Mort de Cæsar*, which was professedly in the English taste as Voltaire conceived that taste to be, and in which he was more British than the British. In time his unacknowledged pilferings drew upon him a brisk fire from across the Channel, and presently he found himself exposed to a flank attack in his own country. In 1746 appeared La Place's translation of five of Shakespeare's plays, followed later by five others. And to these was added a preface in which half-hearted condemnation of the English author was mingled with enthusiastic praise.

This was more than Voltaire was prepared for. He himself had patronized Shakespeare, but with a distinct sense of that author's shortcomings. But when it came to the point of his being read and approved of in France, this was another matter. To quote Professor Lounsbury:

"From the outset Shakespeare had been in his eyes an inspired barbarian. As time moved on, he came to forget the adjective and remembered only the noun."

From this time until his death in 1778 Voltaire never desisted from the struggle in behalf of the honor, not to say of the preservation, of the classic French drama. He was never silent on the subject for long at a time, and toward the end of his life his remonstrance rises to a senile shriek. In

his letters, in his prefaces, in his Commentary on Corneille, in his Philosophic Dictionary, he piles abuse on him whom he now calls Gilles—the clown. His tragedies are heaps of incredible stories, monstrous farces. His breaches of good taste would be tolerated nowhere save in the dark ages of an uncivilized country. And the author himself is a drunken savage.

The climax was reached in 1776, when Le Tourneur published translations of certain of the plays, with a preface in which he stated that hitherto Shakespeare had been known in France only in ridiculous travesties. Now, since Voltaire held himself to be the medium through which a knowledge of the Englishman had filtered into France, he took the reference to be sufficiently obvious; or, on the other hand, if this did not refer to him, so much the worse. In that case he was ignored, as Le Tourneur did not so much as mention him in a preface of one hundred and forty pages.

Voltaire's rage was unbounded. He at once set about the composition of a letter to the Academy, in which Shakespeare should be revealed in all his baseness. Voltaire's idea of giving a fair presentation of his author was to select those passages which are offensive to a sense of delicacy, and to render these in all their coarseness; leaving the impression that such was the general tone of Shakespeare. The letter was read before the Academy on the day of St. Louis, and it did not have the warmest reception—not so warm as D'Alembert was able to make its author believe. This was in 1776; less than two years later the old warrior was in his grave, but he maintained hostilities to the end, and died still trying to lay the implacable ghost from across the Channel.

The first merit of Professor Lounsbury is to have brought together the various criticisms of Shakespeare that Voltaire made at various times and places. His second is to have pointed out the shallowness of Voltaire's knowledge on his subject, and the utter falsity, usually intentional, of his statements. Voltaire has an audacity which imposes on the unwary, and it is only by bringing him to book on his assertions that we can get at the real truth. This Professor Lounsbury has done again and again by putting side by side the facts and Voltaire's perversion of them. Another

valuable addition to the history of the conflict is the citation of writers on the English side; certain of these, like Horace Walpole, are of abiding importance, but most of them have sunk out of sight to-day, and are known not even by name.

Above all, Professor Lounsbury is an impartial judge—a most difficult position to maintain under the exasperation of Voltaire's constant mendacity. While never hesitating to point out the deviousness of the ways by which Voltaire achieved his purpose, in the end he makes honorable amends to the sincerity of the Frenchman's belief in regard to Shakespeare, and the consistency of his attitude. In Voltaire's eyes Shakespeare was a savage, and his adoption in France meant the unspeakable degradation of the beautiful drama of Corneille and Racine.

WALTER T. PEIRCE.

Johns Hopkins University.

FRENCH GRAMMAR.

A Practical Treatise on French Modal Auxiliaries considered in their relation to grammar and idioms; with exercises in reading, composition and conversation by ALFRED HENNEQUIN, PH. D. Boston: D. C. Heath & Co., 1899.

In their explanations of the French auxiliary verbs of mode, the majority—I may say all—of the grammars published in this country leave much to be supplied by the teacher. By far the most complete exposition of the subject is that of Dr. Hennequin in the book in question.

The author devotes one chapter to each of the auxiliaries *devoir*, *falloir*, *pouvoir*, *savoir* and *vouloir*, in the order named. Every possible meaning of each verb is illustrated by French sentences, the English equivalents of which are given in parallel columns. The illustrative examples are followed by a passage of about a dozen lines of French for reading; by a passage of about equal length for French composition; and by an excellent exercise for conversation, which consists of questions, in French, and answers, likewise in French but with the modal auxiliary to be supplied by the student. Each chapter is divided into sections showing the various meanings of the auxiliary.

The divisions of the chapter on *devoir* are

entitled: 1. Indebtedness. (a) Money Indebtedness. (b) Moral Debt. 2. Duty. 3. Moral Obligation. 4. Futurity. 5. Necessity. 6. Certainty. 7. Supposition. 8. Justice. 9. Idiomatic uses of *devoir*.

The section on "Indebtedness" should have formed a chapter by itself, and the section on "Justice" should have been merged into it. *Devoir* expressing "Justice" is not a modal auxiliary any more than is *devoir* expressing "Indebtedness." The fact that the reflexive *se* is required in this construction precludes the possibility of making *devoir* an auxiliary verb of mode. Whether the reflexive pronoun be the direct or indirect object of *devoir*, the verb is no less transitive than in section 1. In spite of the fact that they do not properly belong in a treatise on modal auxiliaries, Dr. Hennequin does well to introduce both of these uses of *devoir* into his book; but in order to avoid the possibility of confusing the student, the author should have emphasized more than by a foot-note (pp. 2 and 4) the fact that *devoir* is not in all circumstances an auxiliary verb. Perhaps a comparison with the English 'will' in its double use as a transitive verb and modal auxiliary would be helpful to the beginner. The note, on page 7, explaining that *devoir* is a modal auxiliary only when followed by a verb in the infinitive, would naturally belong to the chapter suggested above to include sections 1 and 8 of Dr. Hennequin's first chapter.

The section on "Duty" and that on "Moral Obligation" should have been merged into one. There is no good reason for making the two divisions. It is not evident, for example, why the author should have put the sentence "Je sais que je devrais tout lui dire; * *" (p. 7.) under the section on "Duty," and the sentence "Je sais fort bien que je devrais vous le donner" (p. 10) under the section on "Moral Obligation." The duty implied in the latter sentence does not "appeal to our conscience" (p. 10) any more than that in the former. The student who can feel the difference between *devoir* meaning "Duty" and *devoir* meaning "Moral Obligation," as contained in this book, is not in need of a treatise on modal auxiliaries.

The third sentence from the bottom of page 8, and the sixth sentence of the composition exercise

on page 11, do not belong where they are but under the section entitled "Justice," which section should, as already suggested, be included by that treating of "Indebtedness."

The same difficulty that exists in determining whether *devoir* expresses "Duty" or "Moral Obligation" exists also in deciding in favor of "Necessity" or of "Certainty." The reviewer would be interested to know how the author can decide surely that the auxiliary *devoir*, in such a sentence as "Je vous assure qu'ils devront nous le dire, si nous insistons" (p. 19), expresses "certainty" rather than "necessity." The fact is that the dividing line between "necessity" and "certainty," as contained in this treatise, is so indefinite that perhaps it had been well not to attempt to establish it.

The note under section 6 [Certainty] saying that "with the conditional of *devoir*, the meaning changes, and that the idea of *obligation* prevails" is out of place. It would have been a help to some students to state (preferably in the section on "Moral Obligation") that the conditional and the conditional perfect of *devoir* may always be translated by the word 'ought'; and that the English 'ought' is generally, but not always, to be translated by the conditional of *devoir*.

The section on "Supposition" is not needed, as it seeks to establish a differentiation which is of no practical value. The sentences given under this section do not surely express supposition. For example, "Ils ont dû le trouver à l'heure qu'il est" may as well mean 'They must have found him (it) by this time' as to be equivalent to "I suppose they have found him by this time," the rendering given by Dr. Hennequin. The confusion is emphasized by the addition to this section of sentences like "Tout me dit que vous devez chanter," in which *devez* expresses an idea of futurity rather than of supposition.

The section on "Futurity" is well stated. The usual meaning of the present and past tenses of the indicative and subjunctive of *devoir* is that of futurity, and to be translated by 'am (is, are) to' for the present tense, and 'was (were) to' for the imperfect. The author adds that in either case there "may be an additional shade of duty or of a moral obligation." Precisely so; and to the same extent that the English 'am to,' 'was to' may

have the meaning of duty or moral obligation. For example, 'I was to have gone, but I did not go' may imply a shade of duty as well as a probable going which was not realized.

The 'am to,' 'was to' are always to be translated by the present and past tenses of the indicative and subjunctive, but the present and past tenses of the verb *devoir* are not always to be translated 'am to,' 'was to.'

The section treating of the idiomatic uses of *devoir* is well stated. To be sure, the idioms can be found in the large dictionaries, but nowhere so clearly expressed nor so conveniently arranged. These remarks are equally true of the author's treatment of the idiomatic uses of the other modal auxiliaries.

The chapter devoted to the auxiliary *falloir* has the same faults as already noted under *devoir*, namely, the making of unnecessary subdivisions and the introduction of the same idea under two different sections. Why, for example, should the sentence "Il faudra le lui dire tôt ou tard" (p. 28) be cited to show that *falloir* expresses "necessity," and the identical sentence be used again (p. 32) to illustrate the idea of "obligation"? One is at a loss to see any difference between the author's two translations, "It will be necessary to tell it to him sooner or later," and "he will have to be told sooner or later." The keynote of the first section (Necessity, Need, Want) of this chapter is given in the very first French sentence ("Il faut du pain pour vivre"), and the section should have been reserved exclusively for a discussion of the verb *falloir* used without a following infinitive (the infinitive to be supplied being *avoir*). Used in that way, *falloir* may always be translated by "need, want." The part entitled "Necessity," of the first section, would better have been incorporated with section 2 (Obligation, Duty), and perhaps the name of the whole section changed to 'Compulsion.'

The illustrative sentence "Quoi qu'il vous faille, vous en demandez trop" (p. 32) is out of place. There is no "obligation" or "duty" expressed or implied in that sentence, and it belongs in the first section (Need, Want) along with the examples in which the infinitive (*avoir*) is not expressed.

The third section (Difference between) is not essential since in *s'en falloir* the idea of "lacking

or wanting" is implied; and this section might readily be included by section 1 (Need, Want). An important matter not explained in this section is the use of the negative in the subordinate clause when *s'en falloir* itself is negative or accompanied by some word (*peu, rien, presque*, etc.) having a negative sense, or when the phrase expresses interrogation or doubt. In fact, some of the sentences given on pages 34, 35, 36, are not in accord with the rule for the use of the negative in such sentences. The *ne* should be inserted before the *y* in the last sentence on page 34, in the third sentence of the exercise for reading, on page 35, and in the fifth sentence of the second column of the conversation exercises on page 36; on the other hand, there should be no negative in the fourth illustrative example on page 35, nor in the fourth sentence of the second column of the conversation exercises on page 36.

The author's treatment of the auxiliary verb *pouvoir* would be more satisfactory if a few of the sentences which could easily be classed either in section 1 ("Ability, or Inability") or in section 3 ("Possibility or Impossibility") had been omitted. Why should a section be devoted to *pouvoir* used in exclamatory sentences, such as "Que ne puis-je parler français!" and no corresponding section be placed under *savoir* in similar exclamations? The sentence "Que ne sais-je (I would I knew) où il s'en est allé!" (p. 54) is surely as expressive of "desire, or longing to" as any sentence given in the section devoted exclusively to the exclamatory use of *pouvoir*. It would have simplified matters to cite such a sentence as the one quoted above (Que ne puis-je parler français!) under section 1 (Ability, or Inability).

The treatment of the modal auxiliary *savoir* is unsatisfactory because the author fails to distinguish between the transitive and the modal auxiliary use of the verb. The entire first section should have formed a chapter by itself, and the author should have emphasized the fact that *savoir* expressing "knowledge, or understanding" is in nowise a modal auxiliary. The remarks made above concerning the transitive use of *devoir* are pertinent here also, and perhaps even more than for *devoir* because the author does not anywhere state that *savoir* is not always a modal auxiliary.

The section entitled "Ability or Inability," and

that treating of the idiomatic uses of *savoir* are well stated.

The last chapter (*vouloir*) is the most accurately stated. Its four sections (1. "Wish, Desire, Want"; 2. "Determination, Command"; 3. "Willingness, Consent"; 4. "Idiomatic Meanings") are not confused one with another, and there are no irrelevant sentences. Perhaps it would have improved some of the sentences to render by the English word 'quite,' the French word *bien* in such a sentence as "*Nous le voulons bien; mais à une condition.*" (p. 69).

In spite of its imperfections, this book is well worth consultation by the student. The practical, fresh sentences are a decided improvement upon those found in most grammars.

The book is excellently printed and has but few errors. I have noted the following: P. 3, l. 9: "you only owe me a few cents," change to 'you owe me only a few cents'; p. 3, l. 13: "subjective" read 'subjunctive'; p. 6, first column, last line: *quelque* read *quelque*; p. 6, second column, last line but two: *déjà* read *déjà*; p. 8, l. 10: "began" read 'begun'; p. 9, l. 19: *dele* the apostrophe of *Il's*; p. 9, l. 20: *disent* read *dise*; p. 9, l. 21: insert hyphen in *vous-même*; p. 17, l. 26, first column: *parlé* read *parlée*; p. 18, ll. 4 and 5: *à pieds* read *à pied*; p. 28, § 1, l. 7: *qu'il* read *qu'il*; p. 30, l. 4: *qui* read *qu'il*; p. 41, last sentence: "*je crains qu'il ne (puisse) me payer ce qu'il me doit*" is hardly the statement to be expected in answer to the question: "*Pourquoi êtes-vous si inquiet?*" The insertion of *pas* after the verb to be supplied (*puisse*) would make the statement more plausible by making it negative; p. 51, l. 3: *il s'y peut* does not agree with the idiom *il y peut* on p. 50, l. 15; p. 54, l. 24: *s'est en allée* read *s'en est allée*; p. 65, fourth line from bottom: *veulliez* read *veuillez*; p. 66, ll. 14 and 15: insert hyphen in "today"; p. 67, l. 9: *Ne veuillez pas* read *veuillez ne pas*; p. 68, l. 9: if the present subjunctive *allions* is to be retained, perhaps it would be well to explain its syntax in a foot-note; p. 69, third line from end of page: "vengeance" read 'vengeance.'

PIERRE JOSEPH FREIN.

Leland Stanford Jr. University.

SPANISH GRAMMAR.

The Spanish Verb. With an Introduction on Spanish Pronunciation, by 1st Lieut. PETER E. TRAUB, 1st U. S. Cavalry, Assistant Professor of French at the U. S. Military Academy. Under the Direction of Professor E. E. WOOD, Department of Modern Languages, U. S. M. A. New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: American Book Company [1900]. pp. vii + 209.

In the preface we read:

"This book embodies the results of the corresponding portion of the system in vogue at the United States Military Academy, whereby a thorough knowledge of the essentials of Spanish is imparted to the cadet in the short period of three months."

This statement gives the measure of the book. One who has struggled with Spanish for years, feels that the author must either be a man of remarkable linguistic ability, or that his ideas of what constitutes "a thorough knowledge of the essentials of Spanish" are limited.

On page 2 the statement is made that "the sounds in Spanish are not given as sharply as in English, tonic accent being nothing more than a lengthening of the accented syllable." On p. 5 the student is told that "the syllable that is lengthened should always be a little higher in pitch than the others." These two statements do not agree. The first one is obviously wrong. On p. 2, also, the old-time remarks about the pronunciation of Spanish vowels are dished up once more. It is time that such statements as "*a* sounds like *a* in *mama*, *e* like *a* in *bale*, *i* like *ee* in *fee*, etc." be banished from text-books of Spanish. The fact is that there is no vowel in English that sounds like any Spanish vowel. The note immediately following tries to rectify the mistakes just mentioned, but is only partially correct and is of limited value, as it confines itself to Spanish monosyllables.

P. 3, § 19: "F, k, l, m, n, p, t have the same sound as in English." Spanish plosives are not aspirated; Spanish *l* and English *l* are so different as to render such words as *mil*, *sal*, *papel* when pronounced with English *l* almost unintelligible to a Spaniard.

P. 3, § 20, 1: "G" before *e* or *i* is a palatal guttural like *ch* in German *ich*. P. 4, § 22: "J

is always a strong guttural produced by depressing the chin and clearing the throat, causing the soft palate to vibrate." Why this distinction between *g* before *e* or *i* and *j*? The letters are interchangeable in a great number of words, so much so, that in looking up words in a Spanish dictionary, one must constantly take this fact into account. An example is *extranjero* which Professor Traub spells *extrangero*. The description given for *j* also holds good for *g* (+ *e*, *i*) as far as the Castiles north of Madrid are concerned. In Andalusia, Mexico and Cuba the two letters are sounded like a well aspirated English *h*.

P. 4, § 28: "*R* has the sound of *r* in English; out at the beginning and end of words and after *l*, *n*, *s*, it is slightly rolled." The first part of this statement needs no refutation.

P. 4, § 30: "*S* always has the hissing sound of *s* in *sun*." This is not true before voiced consonants, e. g. *mismo*, *los dos*, *cisne*.

P. 4, § 33: "*X* has the sound of *x* in wax." *extrangero* and *extremo* are given among the examples and not a word is said about *x* being sounded like *s* before a consonant. Cf. the spelling *esclavo* for *esclavo*.

P. 7, § —: The division into strong and weak vowels is not arbitrary, but a "natural division" and therefore "diphthongs and triphthongs should always be pronounced more or less the same way, whether they get the tonic accent or not." We fail to understand.

P. 8, § 53: "Generally two or three consonants between vowels are separated; the first one belonging to the preceding syllable." In the next line *en-no-ble-cer* is given as an illustration.

P. 6, § —: *Ruido* is printed without a graphic accent in illustration of a rule concerning diphthongs. On p. 11 the same word is printed twice with a graphic accent. Granted that Spanish usage is not consistent in regard to words of this kind; but a text-book on Spanish ought to be, or ought to state why it is not.

P. 12, § 61: The student is told in what respects the Spanish of Spanish-American countries differs from pure Castilian. Among the American characteristics we find: "*D* in the ending *ado*, is silent: *hablado* pronounced *ablao*." Not only is this pronunciation common throughout Castile, but the present writer also found that in Mexico its use

was restricted. In Castile only a few purists hold out against *ao*, while in Mexico the educated classes generally use *ado*. On the same page we read that: "*es* is generally used for *ex* when followed by a consonant not *h*: *escelente* = *excelente*." This statement is true only in regard to spelling; in regard to pronunciation Castilian usage does not differ from the American. See above.

The uses of the various moods in Spanish take up a little less than three pages. The subjunctive mood is "explained" in a little over a page. We quote: "The rules governing the subjunctive in Spanish are with one or two exceptions, practically the same as in French." The assumption that students of Spanish know French would, in itself, limit the usefulness of this statement; but aside from this, the rule is so far from being correct that it is misleading. Further on the same page we read: "We may say in English, 'if I had' or 'if I should have,' which mean exactly the same thing and correspond precisely to the forms in Spanish, *si hubiese* and *si hubiera*." Comment is unnecessary. On the same page "when he has finished, he will write" is translated *Cuando hubiere concluido*, *escribirá* and throughout the whole book this construction is enforced. The Castilian usage of to-day is *Cuando haya concluido*, etc.

So much for the first seventeen pages. We have picked out only the most obvious mistakes. The rest of the book (one hundred and ninety-two pages) is devoted to the conjugation of verbs, except pp. 76-79 which treat of Pronominal Verbs and Personal Pronouns; p. 90 where an inadequate explanation of the Impersonal Reflexive is given, and pp. 96-97 which discuss in the briefest way the Reflexive Substitute for the Passive. We have, therefore, one hundred and eighty-five pages devoted to nothing else but the accident of the verb—no idioms, no exercises, absolutely nothing except complete conjugations of verbs, with a translation for every single form in the book save in a few lists near the end. Each conjugation as a rule takes up two complete pages.

What was the object of the author in getting out such a piece of work? It contains nothing that the grammars do not treat adequately. Knapp treats the Spanish verb very fully in one hundred and twenty-one pages of large print; Ramsey, in

his larger grammar, in fifty-eight pages, in his smaller grammar, in fifty pages; and Garner in forty-five pages. The only "advantage" we can see in this new book is that it saves thinking on the part of the student and makes the learning of the Spanish verb entirely mechanical and—very tedious. That part of the book which is not taken up with mechanical details is so full of mistakes and slipshod statements that it is worthless.

The book is carefully printed. The only misprints noted are *lavámonos* for *lavémonos*, p. 77, and *dirije* for *dirige*, p. 79.

A. F. KUERSTEINER.

Indiana University.

SOME RECENT INDEXES.

Englische Studien, herausgegeben von Eugen Kölbing: *Generalregister zu Band 1-25*, zusammengestellt von ARTHUR KÖLBING. Leipzig, Reisland, 1902. 8vo, pp. iv, 244. Price, 8 marks.

Übersicht über die im Jahre 1896 auf dem Gebiete der englischen Philologie erschienenen Bücher, Schriften und Aufsätze, zusammengestellt von ALBERT PETRI. *Supplementheft zur "Anglia," Jahrg. 1898-99*, Bd. xxi. Halle, Niemeyer, 1901. 8vo, pp. iv, 175. Price, 4 marks. Same for 1897. *Supplementheft zur "Anglia," Bd. xxii*, 1902, pp. iv, 171. Price, 4 marks.

General-Register zum Archiv für das Studium der neueren Sprachen und Literaturen, 51. bis 100. Band. Zusammengestellt von Dr. HERMANN SPRINGER. Braunschweig, Westermann, 1900. 8vo, pp. iv, 285. Price, 6 marks.

The makers of such indexes as these deserve the thanks of the scholarly world, especially when they do the work in the same thorough and careful manner in which they would conduct original investigations. Such indexes greatly facilitate the work of the student and form valuable additions to his working library, even though he may not possess the periodicals themselves. These three indexes, though not perhaps of equal worth, will all be found of great value.

The problem of the arrangement of such indexes has not yet received a satisfactory solution. Each

of the three before us differs from the others in this respect. Springer, dissatisfied with the simple alphabetical author and subject list of the index to volumes 1-50 of the *Archiv*, has adopted a highly elaborate classification: I. Systematisches Verzeichnis der Beiträge. A. Allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft u. Litteratur. B. Germanische (and C. Romanische) Sprachen u. Litteraturen. D. Neusprachlicher Unterricht. E. Gelehrtenbiographie; gelehrte Gesellschaften. II. Alphabetisches Verzeichnis der Mitarbeiter (mit Aufzählung ihrer Beiträge—in order of publication). III. Alphabetisches Verzeichnis der besprochenen Werke (mit Verweisung auf das systematische Verzeichnis). This is all very well; but the sub-division of these groups, though logical, is perhaps too elaborate—even bewildering: thus Chaucer books and articles are entered in four different places. Kölbing arranges his matter as follows: I. Sach- u. Stellenregister. II. Rezensionenregister, with Sachindex. III. Wortregister. IV. Verzeichnis der Mitarbeiter u. ihrer Beiträge. This arrangement is simpler and more satisfactory. It would have been much better if Kölbing had combined the index to II. with the main part under one alphabet; many entries now in the index would not then have been needed. The arrangement of the *Übersicht* is that which has now been used in that annual for several years. Perhaps the gravest objection to it is the attempt to distinguish between eighteenth and nineteenth century literature (III. 3, 5), also between "Litteratur des 19. Jahrhunderts" (III. 5.) and "Neueste Litteratur" (III. 7.)—divisions of which there is no need. Nor is there any good reason for taking Shakspeare out of the alphabet of "Neuenglische Litteratur." With these exceptions the general arrangement may be defended as logical.

Kölbing's index is a creditable piece of work—well printed, easy to use, generally accurate. I note a few corrections and additions: (pp. 11, 12) since the Cædmonian authorship is not now universally accepted, there should at least have been a cross-reference under *Daniel* and *Satan*; (p. 19, l. 7 f. b.) the entry should be Sutherland, Duke of; (p. 23) under Fletcher should be a cross-reference to Beaumont; (p. 73) why not enter *R. R. Doyster* under Udall, now conceded to be its author?; the seventh entry from the bottom should

be Cambridge, Univ. of; (p. 97) enter Bret Harte under Harte; (p. 99) Brown, for F. M. read E. M.; (p. 102) read Chambers; (p. 103) *The Tale of Gamelyn* should have been entered by itself; (p. 104) under Conrad, with cross-reference from Isaac, should also have been entered *The Mill on the Floss* hrg. von Hermann Isaac (p. 113), who afterward took the name of Hermann Conrad (this fact seems not to be generally known among bibliographers); (p. 125) there should be a cross-reference under Haughton to Chettle; (p. 151) enter here: Murison, W., *Shorter Poems by Burns, Byron, and Campbell*. London, 1893. Ref. E. Kölbing, xix. 136-7; (p. 153) enter *Gorboduc* under Norton and Dorset; (p. 154) enter *O. E. Texts* under Sweet; (p. 161) the entry should be Rolle, Richard; (p. 168) *School and College* was ed. by R. G. Huling; (p. 196 ff.) the subject index is very defective; for example (p. 201) under "Englische Litteratur" there should be a reference to Th. A. Fischer, "Ueber die Einfluss der See auf die englische Litteratur," in his *Drei Studien* (cp. p. 208 s. v. See), and (p. 208) the *Sermo in festis S^{ae} Mariae* should assuredly have been entered under Mary.

I have published a criticism of Petri's *Übersicht* for 1895 in *The Journal of Germanic Philology*, iv. 116-8. The numbers for 1896 and 1897 are not much better: there are likewise numerous errors; there is the same inconsistency in referring now to the volume and number of periodicals, now to the whole number, and again simply to the month; and there is the same ignoring of important reviews in *The Athenæum*, *The Nation*, and even in some German periodicals. Some points may be noted in detail:

1896: (p. 1) the Sievers *Festgabe* was entitled *Philologische Studien*; transfer, then, to p. 3; (p. 2) transfer Dobson to p. 28; to Weinhold *Festgabe* add reference to following entry; (p. 5) to Breymann (which appeared in 1897) add rev. by Klinghardt in *Engl. Stud.* xxiv. 128-33, by Rambeau in M. L. N. xiv. cols. 382-4, by Tobler in *Archiv* xcvi. 221; (p. 7) add Skeat on *hickory* in *Athen.* 1896 ii. 258; (p. 8) Grandgent deals with the phonology, not the etymology of *warmpt* in *Publ. of Mod. Lang. Ass'n*; (p. 9) Gerber appeared in 1895; (p. 10) add Haverfield, F., "Chester," *Athen.* 1896 ii. 201-2; the rev. of

Holthausen in *Litt. Centrbl.* is anon., cp. *Übersicht* for 1895, p. 10; Jespersen's *Progress in Language* (1894) was rev. by Garnett in *Am. Jour. Phil.* xvi. 362-8 (1895); (p. 12) add here also Mayhew's art. noted on p. 169; (p. 18) to Storm add Stoffel, "Some Notes on Joh. Storm's *Engl. Phil.*," *Engl. Stud.* xxv. 329-32, rev. of I. 1., 2. by Klinghardt in *Engl. Stud.* xxiii. 469-72; of the revs. of Streitberg all but the last two, with others, appeared in the 1895 *Übersicht*; add revs. by Schmidt-Wartenberg in M. L. N. xii. cols. 229-32, by Roediger in *Archiv* c. 378-82; (p. 23) to Zupitza add rev. by Finck in *Anz. f. d. Alt.* xxv. 123-7; (p. 26) to Budge add rev. in *Athen.* 1896 ii. 122-3; (p. 27) to Crow add rev. in *Athen.* 1896 ii. 379; (p. 30) Gurteen is rev. in M. L. N. xii.; (p. 34) to Meyer (which appeared in 1897) add rev. by Sarrazin in *Zs. vgl. Littgesch.* xii. 493-6; in *Shak. Jb.* xxxiii. 295; (p. 40) Groth's rev. of Wülker is in *Grenzboten* lv. 4. no. 51; add rev. in *Deutsche Rundschau* xc. 475; (p. 41) to Plummer's *Bede* add rev. in *Athen.* 1897 i. 79-80; the last rev. of Miller's *Place-names* is by A. L. in *Rev. Crit.* '97 no. 13; (p. 44) under "Gesetze" belongs Liebermann, *Über die Leges Edwardi Confessoris*, rev. in *Athen.* 1896 ii. 183-4, by Hübner in *Archiv* xcix. 444-6; to James I. add Miller, A. H. "The King's Quair," *Athen.* 1896 ii. 66; Schleich's rev. of Gattinger is in *Dtsch. Litztg.* 1897 no. 2; (p. 48) the rev. of Moorman's Browne in *Litbl. f. ger. u. rom. Phil.* was written by L. Pröscholdt; to Chambers-Wallace Burns add rev. of i. and ii. in *Athen.* 1896 ii. 92-3; here also is reviewed Henley's Burns (p. 49); (p. 51) Congreve: in *Engl. Stud.* xxv. no. 3 Swaen reviews Schmid's *complete* work, pub. in 1897; (p. 55) to Baker's Lyly add rev. in *Athen.* 1896 ii. 236; under Massinger enter cross-ref. to Chapman, p. 51; (p. 59) to Sawtelle add rev. by Fischer in *Anglia Bei.* x. 130-2; (p. 63) to Boas add rev. in *Shak. Jb.* xxxii. 319-20; to Brandes add rev. by L. Fränkel in *Shak. Jb.* xxxiii. 278-87; Miss Tappan's rev. is of the trans. (1898); (p. 64) to Horton-Smith add rev. in *Shak. Jb.* xxxiii. 297; to Koppel add rev. by Fischer in *Anglia Bei.* x. 135; to Moyes add rev. by L. Pröscholdt in *Shak. Jb.* xxxiii. 296-7; (p. 65) Schwab rev. in *Shak. Jb.* xxxiii. 294; Sievers rev. by P. Hartmann in *Shak. Jb.* xxxii. 321-3; (p. 77) Schnabel's rev.

of Kölbing's Byron is in *Zs. vgl. Littgesch.* N. F. XI. no. 1; in *Anglia Bei.* IX. no. 10 and in *Lit. Centrbl.* '99 no. 29 is rev. the "Engl. Textbibl." ed. (1898); (p. 127) *Sir George Tressady* rev. in *Athen.* 1896 II. 413-4; (p. 147) to Michael add rev. in *D. Rundschau* XC. 475; (p. 153) add *Dict. of Nat. Biog.* XLV.-XLVII. rev. in *Athen.* 1896 II. 378-9; (p. 157) add Lang's *Life of Lockhart*, rev. in *Athen.* 1896 II. 515-7; (p. 160) why enter Cuthbert, Ronan, etc. under *St.*? (p. 163) add *Dolly Madison*, by Maude Wilder Goodwin, rev. in *Athen.* 1896 II. 153; (p. 164) add *Margaret Winthrop*, by Alice M. Earle, rev. in *Athen.* 1896 II. 152-3; (p. 168) add White, *History of the Warfare of Science with Theology in Christendom*, rev. by E. P. Evans in *Die Nation* XIII. 709-10; (p. 171, cp. p. 9) Habben's *London Street Names* is condemned in *Athen.* 1896 II. 598; (p. 173) enter Hale's "'Tis Sixty Years Since' at Harvard" s. v. Cambridge, Mass., p. 169; (p. 174) under Virginia add cross-ref. to Stimson, p. 124.

1897: (p. 1) add *Bibliographica* (Lon. Kegan Paul), completed in Feb. 1897; (p. 3) to "Americanismen" add art. in *Encycl. Brit.: New American Suppl't* I. 154-8; Lodge's "Shakespeare's Americanisms," *Harper's* XC. 252-6 (to be added also on p. 60); and *America and the Americans*, N. Y. 1897, pp. 156-68; (p. 4) to Barrère and Leland add rev. in *Spectator* LXXIX. 84-6 and in *Athen.* 1897 II. 673; add Bates, A., *Talks on Writing English*, Boston; (p. 24) enter Chambers's *Biogr. Dict.* rather on p. 147; (p. 31) to Lee, *Dict. Nat. Biog.* add rev. of vols. XLVIII.-L. in *Athen.* 1897 I. 607-8; (p. 32) why include Myers's *Seed-Sower*? (p. 35) to Selby-Bigge add rev. in *Athen.* 1897 I. 534-5; (p. 36) enter ten Brink's *History of Eng. Lit.* trans. Miss L. Dora Schmitz s. v. Brink and add rev. in *Athen.* 1897 I. 142, *Nation* LXIV. 94, trans. condemned; (p. 42) *Brunanburh* ed. Crow should also be entered s. v. *Brunanburh*, p. 39; (p. 43) enter Miss Weston's *Gawain* s. v. *Gawayne*, p. 41; (p. 44, *Testament of Love*) Bradley's art. appeared Feb. 6, p. 184, *Skeat's* Feb. 13, p. 215; (p. 45) enter Fletcher also on p. 49; (p. 53) to More add Jusserand, J. J., "Thomas Stapleton's Copy of the Works of Sir Thomas More," *Athen.* 1897 I. 215; (p. 54) to Shelton's trans. of *Don Quizote* add rev. in *Athen.* 1897 I. 143-4; (p. 57) to Walton and Cotton add rev. in *Athen.* 1897 I.

237; (p. 65) for *The Strange History of Richard II* read *Stage History*, etc.; (p. 66) add Gates, L. E., *Selections from the Prose of Matthew Arnold*, N. Y., Holt; (p. 72) to Dickens add Holyoake, M. Q., "Memories of Charles Dickens," *Chamb. Jour.* XIV. 721; also art. by David C. Murray in "My Contemporaries in Fiction" in *Canad. Mag.* VIII. 245; (p. 78) to Morris, *The Well at the World's End*, add rev. in *Athen.* 1897 I. 237-9; to Scott's *Bibliography of W. Morris* add rev. in *Athen.* 1897 II. 591-2; (p. 81) owing to the appearance of Lord Hallam Tennyson's *Memoir* much was written that year on the poet; yet Petri s. v. Tennyson musters only 36 references, including both books and articles, while *The Cumulative Periodical Index* gives 76 references, *The Annual Literary Index* gives 40 references, and the *English Index to the Periodicals of 1897*, 36 references, none of the three including books; likewise (p. 82) s. v. Thackeray Petri has only 18 references, books included, while *The Cumulative Periodical Index* has 26, no books; (p. 108) to Kipling's *Captains Courageous* add rev. in *Athen.* 1897 II. 589-90; (p. 120) the Edinburgh ed. of Stevenson was rev. in *Athen.* 1897 II. 213-5, 245-7; (p. 139) to Maitland add. rev. in *Athen.* 1897 I. 274; (p. 142) add here Traill's *Social England* with rev. in *Athen.* 1897 II. 279-80; (p. 152) enter Mulcaster also on p. 12, since he is interesting mainly to philologists; (p. 162) add Field, E., *The Colonial Tavern*, Providence, R. I.

Springer's index to the *Archiv* is the most accurate of the three. So far as we have tested it we have found no errors worth noting. It furnishes proof that Germans need not blunder when dealing with Italian, French, and English titles. We commend it to Herr Petri and others as an example of the kind of indexing most desired among the "Neuphilologen" on both sides of the Atlantic.

CLARK S. NORTHUP.

Cornell University.

FRENCH LITERATURE.

Corneille's Cinna ou la Clémence d'Auguste, edited with introduction and notes by JOHN E. MATZKE, Ph. D. Boston, D. C. Heath & Co., 1903.

Professor Matzke, whose edition of *Hernani* met

with such general favor, turns his attention in the present work to the classical drama. His purpose has been, he says in the preface, to treat the play distinctly as a piece of literature. With this in view he has written an introduction of thirteen pages containing a discussion of the date of the production of the play, its genesis, its sources, and the observation of the unities in it. The notes are grammatical and literary; the former pointing out especially the difference between the usage of the seventeenth and nineteenth centuries, the latter adding bits of literary criticism and gossip with the aim of giving the play a setting. For questions of versification he refers to the excellent treatment of the Alexandrine line in Dr. Eggert's edition of *Athalie*.

The text is that of the edition of Corneille in the series of "Les Grands Écrivains de la France." Dr. Matzke has in a few instances altered the orthography in accordance with modern usage. We note the change of *oi* to *ai* in the endings of the imperfect and conditional tenses, and in such words as *faible*, *faiblesse*; also the substitution of *ait* for *aye* in the third person singular of the present subjunctive (l. 1283). If the book were intended for college students only the advisability of making these changes might well be questioned. The older forms present no difficulty, require simple explanation, and offer a "glimpse of the growth of the language" which Dr. Matzke thinks it desirable to give the student in the matter of usage. Why not here as well? It is doubtless because such texts are to be put into the hands of high school students that these simple changes are so regularly made in classical texts. Dr. Matzke allows *aye* to stand for *ait* in the *Examen*, p. 14. Some misprints occur in the text. In l. 262 *la* for *ta*, l. 485 *mol* is followed by a semi-colon instead of a comma, l. 955 *affermi* for *raffermi*, l. 1078 *en* is omitted, l. 1124 the first *les* should be *des*, and the numeral 1275 is omitted in numbering the lines. The punctuation has been altered in a number of lines, whether by misprint or intention it is not always possible to say, but in no case does the change affect the sense of the passage.

The notes are full and thorough. Some points in them, however, require attention. The form of the statement of the note on l. 147 would seem to

imply that *en* does not frequently refer to persons now as it did in the seventeenth century. In commenting on the expression *à vous attendre* (l. 282). Dr. Matzke says: "*à* here expresses situation with reference to the purpose to be attained. *He is still at your house with the purpose of waiting for you.*" Is 'this not rather misleading?' Whatever the original idea of *à* was in such a sentence it has utterly lost the idea of purpose to-day. The infinitive with *à* is regularly used after *être* where English employs a continuative tense with the present participle. The note on lines 283, 284, is not clear. The second sentence is confusing, and Dr. Matzke himself would be the first to acknowledge the error in the statement that the sentence: "*S'il venait, mon père le verrait,*" is a condition contrary to fact. The third paragraph seems to state that the order of tenses is not logical in English because we translate: "*S'il est venu, mon père l'aura vu,*" by "*If he come, my father saw him.*" May not the same logical order be observed in English, "*If he come, my father will have seen him,*" and does not French employ also the same order of tenses as in the English sentence above, "*S'il est venu mon père l'a vu.*" In a note on l. 656 the translation "*through the result of his remorse*" is suggested for "*pour l'effet d'un remords.*" Is not the idea rather "go free with no other punishment than a feeling of remorse." The word "*offal*" for *rebut*, l. 690, seems rather inept in speaking of an empire. Line 874, "*Qu' une âme généreuse a de peine à faillir,*" is translated "*What pain a noble soul experiences when it falls.*" It may be so translated, but it may be equally well rendered, "How difficult it is for a noble soul to fall." And in this passage where Cinna's feelings are in conflict and he has not yet fully determined to commit the crime, is not the latter the better reading? In line 1110, *je me fais justice* is translated, "*I judge myself aright.*" The meaning, "I condemn and punish myself as I deserve" given in the dictionary of Darmesteter and Hatzfeld is more to the point. In commenting on line 1207, *abjet*, Dr. Matzke remarks that "*e* is omitted to make the rime perfect to the eye." According to M. Marty-Laveaux (*Lexique*, vol. xi, p. 17) there were two forms of this word, the one without *e* occurring within the line as well as at the end.

In the introduction to Scene III of Act IV, the editor speaks of the suppression of the rôle of Livie and of its reintroduction in 1860, but fails to note that it had again been suppressed (cf. Hémon, Cinna, l. 1193, note).

One cannot but wonder that after stating in the preface that points of difference in the usage of French of the seventeenth and that of the nineteenth century require attention, Dr. Matzke should pass over so frequently a part of speech very interesting and important in this respect, namely, the preposition. *Au sang* for *dans le sang* l. 197; *à l'endroit* l. 255; the use of *de* after *espérer* l. 875; of *de* after *commencer*, where modern French usually employs *à*, l. 618; the omission of the second preposition in a phrase like *à César et Pompée*, l. 494, might well be noticed. Why not note, too, the placing of the object pronoun of the complimentary infinitive before the auxiliary verb, as a point in which French of the golden age differs from the modern language; also, the use of *qui* relative, referring to things after prepositions. We can readily understand that Dr. Matzke did not care uselessly to burden his notes with Corneille's Latinisms and obsolete expressions, but points of the kind cited in which the student finds the rules of his grammar transgressed would seem to call for remark. We note the following misprints in the notes: l. 11, *mon père meurtri* for *mon père massacré*; l. 450, *denier* for *dénier*; l. 758 for l. 748.

The points to which we have called attention above are slips such as find their way almost inevitably into texts. We venture, however, to disagree with Dr. Matzke as to what constitutes strictly literary treatment of such a masterpiece. In the introduction the editor discusses the date of the production of the play and adopts the results of Professor Warren's study (MOD. LANG. NOTES, vol. ix, col. 392), states M. Fournier's conjecture that the uprising about Rouen and the punishment of the city suggested to Corneille the subject of the clemency of Augustus, and discusses the sources and the observation of the unities in the play. Is this all that the student of Corneille's masterpiece and French drama needs in the way of help to the appreciation of the play?

It is a regrettable fact that the American student fails very generally to enjoy classic French tragedy.

Even those who read French readily do not appreciate it as they do English and German tragedy. To the ordinary student drama means Shakespeare. He finds something similar in Schiller, the first German dramatist he reads, and having formed his idea of the *genre* from the romantic tragedy, he fails to find any satisfaction in the classic French tragedy. It is filled with long monotonous speeches and is devoid of action and interest. With the exception of the *Cid*, which is more romantic, and of *Athalie*, which is lyric, it is for him a "grind." And we have met Modern Language teachers who feel very much the same way. It cannot be expected that every editor of a classic tragedy should point out the essential character of French drama, how it differs from the romantic drama, from Shakespeare and the Greeks, how it was analytic rather than synthetic, that it sought not to picture life by showing it in action any more than it endeavored to produce its effect by picturing a passion, that it was essentially moral and psychological, and that it aimed to be what M. Lanson terms "*l'étude de la préparation morale d'un fait*." But the notes of an edition which aims primarily at treating the play as literature should at least suggest these points, and such matter in an introduction would do more to aid the student in the appreciation of French tragedy than details of literary history. Have we not a right to demand that the introduction and notes of such an edition should call attention to those characteristics of the play which make it a masterpiece, to the characters which the author has conceived and the way he has drawn them, to the manner in which he has delineated passion, to the peculiar qualities of the author's style—to all those things which have given the author and his production a reputation? It is futile to expect the student to accept a work as great merely because the signature is that of a renowned writer. Dr. Eggert has followed this plan in his edition of Racine's *Athalie*, and is it not admitted that he has given us the best edition of a French classic of which America can boast?

EDGAR S. INGRAHAM.

University of Pennsylvania.

OLD ENGLISH LITERATURE.

The Life and Times of Alfred the Great, Being the Ford Lectures for 1901. By CHARLES PLUMMER, M. A., Fellow and Chaplain of Corpus Christi College, Oxford. With an Appendix. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1902. 8vo, pp. xi + 232.

When Pauli published his *König Aelfred* in 1851, he commented with some severity upon the lack at so late a date of a satisfactory biography of Alfred. Just fifty years elapsed between the appearance of Pauli's work and the presentation of the lectures which are collected in Mr. Plummer's volume, and although a number of works have treated Alfred's life during that time, the popular character of the majority of these makes the later study scarcely less important than the earlier.

Mr. Plummer begins with the warning that it is unlikely that he will be able "to offer anything very new or original" in such a well-worked field, but adds that he hopes at least to tell only what is "approximately true." That as much cannot be claimed for most of the recent works upon Alfred, the author shows by a few citations from these products of what he names the recent "boom in things Alfredian."

The present work may be considered as falling into three parts: the treatment of the sources of Alfred's life; the account of his reign; and the discussion of his literary works. Of these the first gives the author the greatest opportunity for original treatment, and forms perhaps the most interesting portion of the whole work. Here the long-fought battle which, since the primary attack of Thomas Wright, has been waged over the authenticity of Asser's *Life of Alfred* will doubtless be considerably affected by Mr. Plummer's belief in the biographer's integrity.

The defenders of Asser had not before this been convincing in their reasoning. Pauli's reply to Wright was very inadequate, and with his too great respect for the text of Asser constitutes one of the chief faults of his work. Lappenberg, Lingard, Clifford, and Sir Frederick Pollard have also at different times argued for Asser's integrity, but

it may be questioned whether they were successful in answering the attacks of Wright and of Howorth. Mr. Plummer examines the question in a far more thorough manner than has been attempted by any of the preceding investigators. Many of their arguments are, of course, adopted, but in addition to these are some important contributions original with the present author. Of particular importance is the suggestion that in the passage which tells of Alfred's visit to the shrine of St. Neot the wholly irrelevant words "sublevatus est" are the result of incorporation into the text of the gloss of a later scribe, and that these words referred to the removal of the saints' body from Cornwall to Huntingdonshire. If this supposition is correct, the original *Life* must have been written previous to the translation of the saint which is known to have taken place about 975. Such an early date is strong evidence for Asser's authenticity.

From the investigation of the author's language, style, and knowledge of Welsh affairs Mr. Plummer concludes that the *Life* must have been written by a native of that country. The contradictory story of Alfred's sickness, which has aroused much ingenious explanation, is, he thinks, the result of the combination of two different versions. Mr. Plummer's conclusion is expressed in the following words:

"On the whole, then, Asser is an authority to be used with criticism and caution; partly because we have always to be alive to the possibility of interpolation, partly because the writer's Celtic imagination is apt to run away with him. But that there is a nucleus which is the genuine work of a single writer, a South Walian contemporary of Alfred, I feel tolerably sure, and I know no reason why that South Walian contemporary should not be Asser of Menevia."

Such a judgment, reinforced as it is by the similar opinion of Mr. W. H. Stevenson, whose edition of Asser is now in preparation for the Clarendon Press, may be regarded as the final one upon this difficult question.

In that part of the present work which deals with Alfred's life and reign the usual facts are presented in a clear and interesting manner. The explanation of the famous *crux* by which the *Life* declares Alfred to have been "illiteratus" at

twelve years of age is doubtless correct. This certainly refers to his ignorance of Latin. Much less certain is the author's conviction that the view that Athelwold put aside Osburgha to marry Judith should be dismissed as "an abominable theory." The eulogy of Alfred's fame is, however, by no means indiscriminate. Thus the often-vaunted claim that Alfred founded the English navy is very properly regarded as doubtful. Another point which arouses the author's incredulity is Asser's account of Alfred's three-fold division of time, in regard to which he concludes that the biographer was here "attacked by an acute fit of imagination."

The latter part of the work is given to a consideration of Alfred's literary productions. Mr. Plummer regards the *Orosius* as earlier than the *Bede*, and the latter as certainly Alfredian. He is doubtful as to the relation of Alfred to the *Paris Psalter*, but seems inclined to suppose him unconnected with it.

Mr. Plummer has not changed the easy style of personal address in which these lectures were first delivered, and which will make the present volume acceptable to a large circle of readers. At the same time his numerous foot-notes testify to the exact and careful manner in which this excellent study is prepared.

L. WARDLAW MILES.

Johns Hopkins University.

ITALIAN LITERATURE.

Una Questione d'Amore, by PIO RAJNA. (Estratto della "Raccolta di Studii Critici dedicata ad Alessandro D'Ancona festeggiandosi il XL Anniversario del suo Insegnamento," pp. 553-568.) Firenze, Barbèra, 1901.

The pages 36-37 of Vol. xxxi of the *Romania* (Pio Rajna: *Le Questioni d'Amore nel Filocolo*) contain but a brief résumé¹ of the treatment of the *detached* episode which was previously pub-

lished in the collective volume offered to Professor D'Ancona in 1901. I am fully convinced that in America as well as in Europe festival collective publications are not always placed within reach of the various readers of scientific reviews. Any one who wishes, in perusing Professor Rajna's recent masterly study in the *Romania*, to inquire more profoundly into the intrinsic details which were summed up there in order to trace the origin of the first of the thirteen love-questions contained in Boccaccio's *Filocolo*, might be deprived of a fitting opportunity to do so. I therefore believe that I shall render a not wholly superfluous, though modest service to American readers of the *Romania* if I here attempt to disentangle once more the various threads of those cobweb results, due to the marvelous handling of the genetical method, which represents perhaps the principal characteristic of the genius of the eminent Italian scholar.

The first love-debate of the *Filocolo* treats of a young woman who, being entreated to mark her preference for one of her two lovers, crowns the head of the one with her own wreath of flowers, whilst hurrying to adorn herself afresh with the garland snatched from the other. Professor Rajna chooses to turn our attention to the Βαβυλωνιακά of Giamblico and to the episode related by Chirio Fortunaziano in the first book of his *Arte Rettorica*. In Giamblico the love tokens amount to the number of three because there are three rivals to be taken into consideration. The first receives the cup from which his love had been drinking, the second her wreath of flowers, the third a kiss. Fortunaziano but reverses the order of the love tokens: the first lover is embraced, the second receives *residuum poculum*, the third is crowned. With Savaric de Mauleon we encounter quite different marks of affection: 1. an amorous look. 2. a tender pressure of the hand. 3. of the foot. Must this substitution needs be ascribed to the observance of reality? Professor Rajna thinks not. The multiplicity of love tokens enumerated by Isidorus, *Origines* (I 25, 26) comprises two which Nevio has in common with Savaric: the tender pressure of the foot and the amorous winking. Besides, Isidorus in the same place quotes Sol., *Prov.* (VI 13): "annuit oculo, terit pede, digito

¹ "Io non ho qui se non da ripresentare in forma succinta e con diverso congegno cose già da me dette."

loquitur." Isidorus has been evidently furnishing new materials for the troubadour's *Partimen*. We are face to face with a "contamination."

The problem becomes more complicated as soon as the Italian *derivations* are examined. Professor Rajna quotes five sonnets.² Perhaps the number might still be increased by other valuable contributions from unedited codices. But there are hardly any important links missing in the careful *exposé*, though probably the primitive samples of vulgar poetical reshaping of the antique mold are irrevocably lost. But the few specimens given allow us to discern sundry parallels. There are sonnets more or less directly descended from Savaric; there are others which combine Fortunaziano's type with some of Savaric's characteristics. The existence, co-existence or non-existence of the *garland* forms the cardinal point with regard to Boccaccio's revival of the hazardous topic. In two cases the kinship with Boccaccio becomes obvious. The so-called Adrianus' sonnet is, perhaps, the latent model into which Boccaccio's genial power infused new life, whilst Petro Montanaro's poem very likely emanates from the *Filocolo*.

M. J. MINCKWITZ.

München.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editors of *Mod. Lang. Notes*.

SIRS:—The following list of thirty one questions is an exact copy of the blank sent by the president of a western State university to candidates for positions as teachers in his Faculty. Not a word, not a syllable, has been altered.

"University of..... Application Blank.
Signature.....
Position desired.....
Date.....

1 What was your age last birthday?

² We are indebted to him for the *editio princeps* of the sonnet by Antonio dalla Foresta to Lorenzo Moschi (Codice Riccardiano 1103, 107^a), for the reëdition (with variants) of P. Montanaro's sonnet, and, besides, for numerous careful text-revisions.

- 2 What is your height?
- 3 Your weight?
- 4 Your complexion?
- 5 Are you of a nervous or phlegmatic temperament?
- 6 In what condition is your health?
- 7 Kindly send a recent photograph?
- 8 Are you fond of society?
- 9 Are you considered popular?
- 10 Do young people like you?
- 11 Are you considered a good public speaker?
- 12 Have you ever conducted teacher's institutes or taken part in them in any way? State your experience.
- 13 Can you help increase the attendance of a university by canvassing for students?
- 14 Are you fertile in making suggestions?
- 15 What church do you attend?
- 16 Are you a member?
- 17 Do you smoke or chew?
- 18 Do you drink?
- 19 Have you any other habits good or bad?
- 20 What is your nationality, and where were you born?
- 21 Are you married?
- 22 If not, have you been?
- 23 How many children have you?
- 24 Where have you taught before, and how long at each place?
- 25 What was your salary at the last place?
- 26 Were you successful?
- 27 In what do you consider yourself stronger, scholarship or discipline?
- 28 If elected to a position, would you make the advancement of the institution of as much importance as the improvement of yourself, scholastically and materially?
- 29 Should you be willing to assist students at all times, even if considerable attention outside of regular hours were required?
- 30 How many hours a week are you willing to teach regularly?
- 31 Of what teachers' agencies are you a member?"

Such is the blank!

Our first feeling on reading it is amusement, our second indignation. What could be more amusing than: "Are you fertile in making suggestions?", "Do you smoke or chew?"—perhaps this should

be punctuated: Do you smoke, or chew?—; "Have you any other habits good or bad?"; "Are you married? If not, have you been?" Again, how naïve must be the originator of this blank if he supposes that he will receive truthful answers to such questions as: "Are you considered popular?"; "Do young people like you?"; "Were you successful?" Of course, the information asked for in many of these questions would be desirable to know, but the impossibility of obtaining it from the candidate himself is apparent.

Our indignation and contempt are aroused when, on looking closer at these questions, sent out from a supposed seat of higher learning, we notice the kind of a man evidently desired by the president. We can easily discern what this man must be: he must be of irreproachable mediocrity, or rather submediocrity:—He must be fond of society, must be considered popular, must pique himself on his oratory. He must have frequented teachers' institutes,—absit omen!—; he must be willing to canvas for students; he must be fertile in suggestions; must be a regular attendant and member of an orthodox church; must not smoke or chew or drink; must be a person of such training and limitations as to discuss seriously the question: "In what do you consider yourself stronger, scholarship or discipline?" He must be at so low an ebb "scholastically and materially" as to promise that, if named, he will be willing to assist students at all hours. In addition, he must agree to teach "regularly" a fabulous number of hours. Finally, he is supposed to be a member of teachers' agencies. Such is the type of man that would meet the ideal of the president who wrote this blank. Now, while some of these qualifications are desirable in a university teacher, we may safely assert that a man who fulfilled them all could only be a man of limited training, a man who should never be placed in a professor's chair, not even in a poorer sectarian "college," or "normal" school.

The folly of many of these questions has already been mentioned. Their charlatanism is no less marked. The disastrous effect of such a college administration as is here suggested is beyond doubt. The best faculty in the land, renewed on the lines of this blank, would soon sink to the level of the poorer sectarian "college," or the correspondence school.

One cannot so much blame the president who emits such a list of questions, as the board which appointed him, and, back of the board, public opinion. Let us suppose that a president is to be chosen for a typical college or university in this country. One might expect that the appointing boards would look into the qualifications of all citizens possessed of the requisite training, talent and character,—that there would be no restriction of the field of candidates. In fact, however, the field is halved, quartered, and halved again. The main object of the boards seems to be to secure a "safe man." To this end, all possible appointees who are not devout members of some one—too frequently of some particular one—of the larger evangelical sects, and who do not belong to the political party locally in power, are at once set aside. This is a very serious limitation of the field. Without going further and showing how the candidates remaining are emasculated by the rejection of the keenest and most vigorous—for they might not prove "safe"—we can readily see that the president of the average American university or college must be relatively a weak brother, distinctly below the level of his better professors. He is too often a man who has tried several careers and failed, and his mouth is generally filled with pedagogic terms and religious cant. He is frequently a time-server, a man whose influence cannot fail to be injurious to youth, whose entire life will not show one example of vigorous, independent thinking, of courageous and virile action, of conspicuous virtue. This man surrounds himself with a faculty composed largely of sycophants, misfits and charlatans. These men govern, and the cause of education is ruined in that institution for a generation.

Why is it that we continue to send our children to such schools? It is mainly because, as a nation, we are too young to have learned the great lesson that all things are not created equal—that there is in education, as in every thing else, a standard article, and that the standard article is always the best. We do not realize that there are startling and decisive differences among universities, and that the best are none too good.

RAYMOND WEEKS.

University of Missouri.

A NOTE ON *Henry VIII*.*To the Editors of Modern Language Notes.*

SIRS:—In *Henry VIII*, Act V, scene 4, there is a passage,—“These are the youths that thunder at a play-house and fight for bitten apples; that no audience, but the tribulation of Tower-hill, or the limbs of Limehouse, their dear brothers, are able to endure.” Since the word “tribulation” was so commonly used as a Christian name by Puritans, it has been conjectured that Shakspeare here referred to a separatist congregation in the vicinity of the Tower. Wheatley, (*London, Past and Present*, 1891) though granting the probability of the conjecture, fails to understand why men of that religious bent should be supposed to enjoy the disorders of the play-houses. One editor has ingeniously suggested that Shakspeare, in ridicule of the Puritans’ scruples against the drama, meant that they approved of riotous conduct there in that it rendered inaudible the words of the abhorred plays. A more natural explanation occurs to me. Puritans were always represented on the stage as lovers of contention. Dekker regarded their “lectures” as places “to talke and make a noise” (*Westward Ho.*, p. 292). Jonson, Marston, (*Dutch Courtesan*) and all other playwrights allude to their fondness for disputation and controversy, and to their demonstrative zeal in prayer and exhortation. Hence one might presuppose, if he wished, a certain sympathy between the gallants and the groundlings, and their soberer brethren. Further illustration of this point, and, at the same time, a more luminous explanation of the nature of Shakspeare’s allusion is found in D’Avenant’s *The Wits*, (iv, 2) where we read,—

“Our theatres are raz’d down; and where
They stood, hoarse midnight lectures preach’d by wives
Of comb-makers, and midwives of Tower-wharf.”

The Wits was licensed in 1633-34; but if the neighborhood around the Tower was then noted for its Puritan inhabitants, it is highly probable that a dissenting congregation assembled there in the days when *Henry VIII* was first produced. The passage, at the least, indicates that D’Avenant,

who knew Shakspeare’s works so intimately, interpreted his lines as a reference to such a religious body.

ELBERT N. S. THOMPSON.

*Yale University.*VOLTAIRE’S “ÉPÎTRE À MME. LA MARQUISE
DU CHATELET SUR LA CALOMNIE.”*To the Editors of Mod. Lang. Notes.*

SIRS:—Mr. Borgerhoff, in his review of Mr. Eggert’s excellent edition of Voltaire’s *Zaïre and Épîtres* (*Modern Language Notes* for March, 1903, pp. 85 and 86), seems, like the editor, to have neglected or not recognized the allusion in ll. 81-85 of this epistle. The reference is to La Fontaine, Book ix, fable 6.

Voltaire’s lines (p. 178 of the edition) run:

Que le mensonge un instant vous outrage,
Tout est en feu soudain pour l’appuyer:
La vérité perce enfin le nuage,
Tout est de glace à vous justifier.

And La Fontaine’s (last strophe of “Le statuaire et le statue de Jupiter,” as above stated):

Chacun tourne en réalités,
Autant qu’il peut, ses propres songes:
L’homme est de glace aux vérités,
Il est de feu pour les mensonges.

A comparison of the two extracts leaves no doubt as to the allusion and enables us to dispense with the note (p. 181), in which Mr. Eggert says that “the figure is not very clear.”

MARY VANCE YOUNG.

*Mt. Holyoke College.**To the Editors of Mod. Lang. Notes.*

SIRS:—In your issue for Feb. 1901 (vol. xvi, cols. 123-4) a correspondent drew attention to a supposed arithmetical error in Valdés’ *José*, (Davidson edition, pages 30-31). In reading the

book recently, I was convinced that the error did not exist, and that your correspondent had misapprehended the author's intention. I will not restate the case, which will be found clearly set forth in the original communication, and indeed it would not be worth while to devote much space to proving Valdés an expert mathematician; I wish merely to state the misconception involved.

After señá Isabel has reckoned up the value of the catch of José's boat for the past week at the current rates, she proceeds to put in force the special reduction which José has granted her. This reduction does not, however, apply to the whole catch, as has been assumed in the calculation above referred to; it applies only to the three shares falling to José himself, one as a member of the crew, and two as owner of the boat (cf. p. 14, l. 30). The rest of the catch, namely, that belonging to the rest of the crew, must have been paid for at the regular rate, which was about 32.6 maravedís per pound. The special reduced rate given by José was about 25.5 maravedís. Now we have not the data wherewith to obtain the average rate for the whole catch, since we are nowhere told how many men formed José's crew. If we were to assume, for example, that there were six beside José, we should have a total of nine shares, three of which were paid for at 25.5 maravedís per pound, and six at 32.6, giving a total average of about 30.2. As the rate which señá Isabel fixes to save working out the figures is 28 maravedís, she would, if we assume a crew of seven in all, cheat him of a sum amounting to 2.2 maravedís per pound on the whole—in accordance with the author's statements. In order to make señá Isabel cheat herself, as is stated by your previous correspondent,—that is, to bring the total average down to less than 28 maravedís—José's crew must be reduced to two, himself and one assistant; and we know that it was much larger. So one is safe in acquitting the novelist of error in this instance, noting that the annotator of the book is in any case mistaken.

S. G. MORLEY.

Harvard University.

BARTHOLOMEW FAIR.

To the Editors of Mod. Lang. Notes.

SIRS:—Jonson seems to have consulted his friend Selden about the meaning of that prohibition in Deuteronomy touching "the counterfeiting of sexes by apparel." In Selden's works [Ed. 1726, II, ii, 1691] there is a long letter to Jonson on the subject, full of curious learning. Selden says the translation of the text should be: "A man's armour shall not be upon a woman, and a man shall not put on a woman's garment;" and he explains the prohibition by showing that these travesties were used in certain idolatrous and lewd practices of the heathen. He also mentions the subject in his *Table Talk* [Arber, p. 85].

WM. HAND BROWNE.

Johns Hopkins University.

PERSONAL.

Professor Fred N. Scott (University of Michigan) has become head of the department of Rhetoric. Professor Isaac N. Demmon's title henceforth will be Professor of English.

Professor Scott has been engaged by the Chicago board of education to give a course of five lectures on the teaching of English composition, at the Chicago Normal School.

Dr. Warren W. Florer, instructor of German at the University of Michigan, will read a paper on "The Direct Method as a Basis for Literary Interpretation" before the National German American Teachers' Association which meets at Erie, Pa., July 1-3, next.